	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	1	PROCEEDINGS
	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION	2	(8:02 a.m.)
		3	MR. COLE: We just got the thumbs up
		4	from out front. It looks like the line is
		5	dwindling down, so we'll go ahead and get started.
		6	We've got a lot of stuff to cover and only a few
		7	hours to do it in.
		8	But thanks for showing up. I know it's
		9	not easy to get here, and then it's even harder to
		10	get in the building, so we do appreciate your
	ALLIANT 2 SMALL BUSINESS PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE	11	being here.
		12	The seats, I mean, the registration
		13	filled up, but I'm still seeing a few empty seats.
		14	Hopefully, we will have some people wandering in a
		15	little bit later.
		16	Now, just some administrative stuff to
		17	cover. You know, we're scheduled for four hours,
		18	so if you need a break, out the room, turn right,
		19	right again, go down about 20 feet, and there's
		20	restrooms down the hall.
	Washington, D.C.	21	We do have, I do want to bring to
	Tuesday, July 12, 2016	22	everybody's attention that we do have a certified
	1405441, 041, 15, 2010		Page 3
1	PARTICIPANTS:	1	court reporter here taking transcript of today's
2	Welcome:	2	session, and that session will be made available
3	DEAN COLE	3	on FedBizOops a few days after we wrap up the
4	Business Management Specialist, ITS	4	event and we get the transcript and post it.
5	GWAC Success and Overview:	5	I'll just go ahead and introduce the
6	MICHAEL McFARLAND Director of Acquisition Operations, ITS	6	group that came with me from Kansas City. By the
7	GWAC Program:	7	way, I'm Dean Cole. I'm the Business Management
8	CASEY KELLEY	8	Specialist out of The Small Business GWAC Division
9	Acting GWAC Program Director & A2/A2SB Project Manager, ITS	9	at Kansas City, Missouri. We run the VETS
10	A2SB RFP Overview:	10	contract, 8(a) Stars 2 contract, and Alliance
11	GREG BYRD	11	Small Business.
12	Alliant 2 Small Business Procuring Contracting Officer	12	We're currently evaluating the VETS 2
13		13	GWAC. As you know, the RFP (inaudible) for A2SB
14	* * * *	14	or you wouldn't be here. And we're also doing the
15		15	on-ramp evaluations for Stars 2, so we're quite
16		16	busy, but we wanted to make sure that we got out
17		17	and had a chance to talk to everybody regarding
18		18	the A2SB Proposal.
19		19	With me today, we've got Matt Verhulst.
20		20	He's the Director of GWAC Acquisitions. Greg Byrd
21		21	will be talking to you a little bit later. He's
22		22	going to be covering the meat and potatoes of the
	Page 2		Page 4
			5

Page: 2 (5 - 8)

pre-proposal conference.

2.2

As you can see, the agenda is up on screen. So we do have a couple of guest speakers. I'll introduce them as they come up, but I just want to make sure I cover everything here.

Oh, yeah. You guys when you checked in, you received index cards. That's for the question and answer session. I don't know if they told you outside, I'm sure they probably mentioned it, but we don't have mics out here, and in the interest of time, and making sure we get every question in our hands, we ask that everybody write their questions down on the index cards. We'll be having folks wander around picking those up throughout the presentation, or you can just wait until we, we will have a break a little bit later on. You may hold off until Greg does his part because he'll probably answer a lot of the questions you have.

But go ahead. You know, if you're like me and I forget things if I don't write them down right away, so it might not be a bad idea to at

Page 5

least jot them down.

I think I pretty much covered the agenda and everything I'm going to cover, so without further ado, I want to bring up the Director of Acquisitions Operations, Michael McFarland. He's going to say a few words about our GWAC successes over the years.

Thank you very much. Michael.

(Applause)

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ McFARLAND: Thank you, and welcome to the Alliant 2 Small Business Pre-Proposal Conference.

Alliant Small Business is and continues to be one of GSA's premiere small business information technology vehicles. We're proud that Alliant Small Business suppliers are providing flexible access to customized IT solutions throughout the government.

Alliant Small Business allows for long-term planning for large-scale program requirements due to its long -- thank you, Paul -- due to its long period of performance and

multi-year options.

Alliant Small Business solutions encompass all components of an integrated IT solution, including new technologies.

The GSA Small Business GWAC Center currently operates three contracts with specialized socioeconomic designations. As Dean indicated, we are under recompetition or open season for all of them at once. So we're very busy right now.

Each contract is designed to provide a streamlined method for agencies to utilize highly qualified small businesses to meet their IT needs while achieving their agency socioeconomic contracting goals.

Premier among our small business GWACs is Alliant Small Business. The Alliant Small Business GWAC focuses on providing government contract opportunities to a wide range of highly-qualified small businesses.

diverse pool of nearly 50 industry partners. With availability through 2024, Alliant Small Business allows for long-term planning of large-scale program requirements while strengthening opportunities for small businesses.

In FY15 alone, Alliant Small Business received 90 task orders, and over 1.2 billion in obligations, which was an increase of 8 percent over the previous year.

Alliant Small Business has been a remarkable success for agencies, for you, our industry partners, and for GSA. Alliant Small Business has quickly become one of the most successful small business GWACs in the government.

For six-and-a-half years of Alliant
Small Business, 30 or more federal agencies have
awarded nearly 5 billion in task orders. Alliant
Small Business has taught us the importance of
partnerships, education, and training for both our
agency customers, and our industry partners, and
customer service in developing and delivering
successful contract vehicles.

Page 8

2.2

The Navy selected Alliant, Alliant Small Business as a mandatory use contracts for IT services, which is just one example of how agencies value the Alliant portfolio of contracts.

As a pre-computed vehicle, Alliant Small Business is streamlining the acquisition process for many government agencies. And through this streamlining, agencies save taxpayer dollars, and they can more quickly and efficiently procure needed IT solutions.

One thing that has always impressed me since I've gotten here about the Alliant Small Business, and the GWAC Program here at GSA in general, is the amount of collaboration that goes on between all the parties.

Success on projects through Alliant

Small Business is a three-part partnership - GSA,
procuring agencies, and the companies performing
the work under the Alliant task orders.

The GSA GWAC Program operates using three C's for success: Communication, collaboration, and competition. We will continue Page 9

this for Alliant 2, and Alliant 2 Small Business.

The relationships we've built with our government and industry partners have been, and will continue to be, critical to the program's success.

I want to thank you for everything all of you have done for both Alliant Small Business, and to help us with this new GWAC, Alliant 2 Small Business.

Now, the GSA GWAC Program, leader in government- wide acquisition contracts, having established one of the very first GWACs in the government, the answer contract in 1999, in creating more GWACs than any other federal agency has developed the Alliant 2 and Alliant 2 Small Business solicitations, which were the sequel, the very prominent and successful Alliant Small Business GWACs.

ITS couldn't be more excited about the future of our GWAC Program. Alliant 2 and Alliant 2 Small Business have been developed to continue to provide support to federal agencies that have

mission critical complex IT service requirements, especially for long-term programs.

Alliant 2 and Alliant 2 Small Business presolicitation phase has raised the bar in transparency and collaborative processes involving both federal agency and industry partners.

The Alliant 2 and Alliant 2 Small
Business team performed thorough market research,
and laid significant groundwork in the preplanning
phase with efforts including an interact group
with more than 7,000 members, a publicly- reviewed
business case on OMB MAX, meetings with the
Coalition for Government Procurement, FSEA

(inaudible) Northern Virginia
Chapter, the Alliance for Public
Sector, Defense Procurement and
Acquisition Policy, the Office of
Federal Procurement Policy, Small
Business Administration, U.S.
Department of State, and ACT-IAC.

We've had numerous presentations through interested agencies. We have a customer working ${\tt Page} \ \ 11$

group of 30 members from 11 agencies. We have an industry working group with more than 500 participants. We've put out two RFIs for industry comments through FedBizOops.

We've had two industry days with more than 500 attendees. We've had face-to-face, one-on-one meetings between industry and Alliant 2, Alliant 2 Small Business staff with more than 350 registrants.

The collaborative input and feedback toward the development of Alliant 2 and Alliant 2 Small Business this past year has been a major contribution to what we believe is an outstanding final product. Notable enhancements between Alliant and Alliant Small Business, and Alliant 2, Alliant 2 Small Business include scope improvements, standardized information technology, service labor categories, new cyber security standards which are a focus of our administrator, and OMB, new environmental standards, increasing competition for orders which provide savings for agencies, and more opportunities for our industry Page 12

2.2

Page: 4 (13 - 16)

partners, and the incorporation of required DFARS clauses and provisions into the master contract so that they automatically flow down to task orders issued by DOD agencies.

We recognize your contributions and your providing insights to the changes we've made since the first draft RFPs. I'm confident that you will be pleased with the final product and the role you've each played in it.

We at GSA cannot overemphasize how the collaboration within GSA with our customer agencies, and with our industry partners while doing market research, and in planning future solicitations and innovations is key to being sure what we want to do is vetted, is on the right track, and considers all viewpoints.

The Alliant 2, Alliant 2 Small Business collaborative process is the lodestar by which ITS is guiding the development of our other contract offerings. ITS is committed to keep our contracts, including Alliant 2 Small Business, with sharing, growing, and evolving in the new

traditionally don't do. I much prefer speaking extemporaneously, but I guess I'm, through me what you'll see, hopefully see is the conduit that I present the passion to the team that represents the GWAC Program, both contracting and programming.

Page 13

So with that, I just want to share my words here. So, first, I want to thank industry for their participation today and for attending. I want to thank Michael and GSA leadership for their support, specifically, Tom Sharpe, Kevin Youl-Page, Mary Davie, Kay Ealy, Bill Zelinski, Michael McFarland, Maynard Crumm, and Randy Burleson. That's the leadership that has supported us to get to this point here today.

A special thanks to John Cavadias, and Greg Byrd, the procuring contracting officers, for their leadership. If not for their leadership, you don't have the collaboration, the transparency that you've seen through this process to date.

And, finally, a special thanks to all A2, Alliant 2, Alliant 2 Small Business team

Page 15

marketplace.

And now, I'd like to turn you over to Casey Kelley, the Director of the GWAC Program at ITS. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. KELLEY: Good morning everybody. My name is Casey Kelley. I'm the current acting Director for the GWAC Program for (inaudible) GSA. Part of that I was the Enterprise GWAC Division Director in San Diego, and also the Program Manager for Alliant, the current Alliant contract.

So since then, I've been the program manager for the Alliant 2, Alliant 2 Small
Business GWACs, and have worked with this team that has gotten us to this stage today.

So I was flattered when Greg and Matt asked me to come and say a few words. So those of you who know me know I can talk, so I committed that I would only talk for less than five minutes. I brought it down a little, some notes what I wanted to say yesterday morning at the airport, and so I want to just speak from this which I

members who I'm not going to list, but you know who they are, and the impact that they've had to this, this whole acquisition to this, for this process.

There's a saying in business, in investing that goes something like this. Past performance is no indicator of future success. That may be if there is no coincidence why there are so many people here today and tomorrow, and also on the virtual call that this team has set up for next Monday.

The expectation for Alliant 2, Alliant 2 Small Business to be as successful, if not more successful, than the current Alliant, Alliant Small Business GWACs, which have done \$34 billion to date by over 60 agencies combined are high, and that they should be.

Those expectations were high when this team began market research in the acquisition planning process over three years ago. And this team has delivered in creating what I believe personally is an even better contract from the Page 16

2.2

current Alliant, Alliant Small Business contracts, and that's saying a lot because there was a lot of blood, sweat, and tears in those contracts for any of you incumbent small businesses out there on those know firsthand.

The team didn't construct, quote/unquote, construct, this contract, Alliant 2 Small Business, or Alliant 2. What they did was they created these contracts. And it's very important to know the difference between those two words, create and construct.

When you create something, your love for what you are doing begins at inception, and it's constant throughout. Whereas, when you construct something, your love is contingent upon what that final outcome is.

This culture within the GSA GWAC organization is one of creativity, passion, and excellence. Everyone here loves the mission of the GSA GWAC organization, and the opportunity to make a difference by serving our country, by helping all agencies acquire the greatest IT

Page 17

service solutions better, faster, and cheaper.

It is that came passion that leads to an acquisition process in customer service that is unprecedented in terms of engaging with customers and industry to create an excellent product in the end.

As Michael alluded to, internet posts, RFIs, draft RFPs, industry days, face-to-face, one-on-ones, and now having these pre-proposal conferences have all resulted in a very thoughtful final product that has taken into consideration input and feedback from thousands of questions of which all were considered, and more than some even implemented.

I personally have never been more proud of working with such a fine group of men and women who are all committed to excellence and making a difference. Knowing myself firsthand how successful Alliant, Alliance Small Business have done after a rocky start seven-and-a-half years ago, with nowhere near the collaboration with industry that we've seen today under these two

contracts, nor the collaboration with government, and knowing how committed our team is to continuing improving our performance, I have zero doubt that Alliant 2, Alliant 2 Small Business will even be more successful than the current Alliant, Alliant Small Business GWACs.

Yes, it is true that past performance is no indicator of future success. However, I have no doubt that Alliant 2 and Alliant 2 Small Business will be successful.

I personally wish each of you could decide to compete on this GWAC here, or on the unrestricted Alliant 2 GWAC. I wish each of you to join us for this journey, and the best of luck, and I look forward to working with those of you who are successful in helping you best meet the needs of our customers working together for the next several years.

So as I said, I hate reading. It's really not my style. You out there in this audience, you're the difference makers. At the end of the day, it's you that are delivering the

Page 19

solutions to our customers that we're trying to attract.

Hopefully, what we've put together to date is something that you'll respect and honor, the effort that's been put into it, and I'm hoping those of you who are successful, those 80-plus primes, plus ties continue that same passion that the current incumbents under Alliant 2, I'm sorry, that the current incumbents under Alliant Small Business have performed to day to help us continue that same legacy that we started seven-and-a-half years ago. So thank you.

(Applause)

MR. BYRD:: : Yeah, I don't want to drink your water. Good morning, everyone. Well, this portion -- I'm actually going to only be spending about 30 minutes, and what I'm going to focus on in that 30 minutes is probably what's most interesting to you guys is I am going to concentrate on Section L and the proposal requirements.

But before I get started, there is, I'm

Page 20

2.2

Page: 6 (21 - 24)

going to give an opening statement, and I'm going to just read it verbatim.

Today, in response to questions, I will be speaking -- and I don't have my reading glasses. Left them in the hotel. I will be speaking about the A2SB RFP. If there is a difference between what is said today and the written language of the RFP, the written language of the RFP governs.

Only an RFP amendment posted on FedBizOops can change the RFP.

Now I'm very pleased to be visiting with you today at this pre-proposal conference -- I'm so sorry. As has been illustrated by previous speakers, GSA has been successfully and thoughtfully partnering with industry on GWACs and A2SB in leading the way with the future for federal information technology acquisition.

As the procuring contracting officer for A2SB, what I want to accomplish today is to share an overview of the RFP structure, to reply to some of the questions asked today and were sent to

Page 21

A2SB@gsa.gov, and to also reply to some of the questions that will be submitted on index cards here in this meeting.

Regarding questions and responses, please recall that GSA reserves the right to publicly discuss, and publish, or simply consider questions and comments regarding the RFP.

That said, in the time available today, it is not possible to address every question asked, but I will touch on some that have been asked frequently or stand out.

You can expect one or more rounds of questions and responses to be published on FedBizOops, including those that are covered today. Please remember, the A2SB procuring contracting officer is the sole point of contact for the procurement, and can be reached at A2SB@gsa.gov. Boy, that was painful.

So, as I said earlier, I can't walk around because I got to stay in front of this microphone. But as I said earlier, I'm going to be focusing on Section L. A little bit of Section

M at the end, but mostly on L.

Page 22

So as far as the A2SB contract is concerned, or the solicitation, it is a multiple award indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity contract for IT services, and IT services- based solutions. It is a total small business set-aside. The NIACS code is 541512, and the associated small business side standard is 27.5 million.

Now, what I would like to say about that is that this is -- what I'm going to do throughout this is I'm going to weave answers to questions that I have gotten already since the issuance of the RFP. So I'll do it conversationally as I'm giving this presentation.

And here is one of the questions actually. As far as the NIACS code is concerned, you know, we have, there were huge changes between the draft RFPs and the final RFP. Probably one of the biggest changes in that is because of the NDAA of 2016 allowing for a contract teaming arrangements, and the members of those teams

Page 23

Page 24

whether JVs, or prime, and a team of subcontractors to be able to use their individual experience for members of the joint venture, or the prime and team of subcontractors.

As you know, each one of those members of those CTAs have to be small businesses, and the NAICS code that counts to those small businesses is 54152. So you can't use other NAICS codes that the contract is not using to determine whether they're a small business.

For instance, employee counts, other

NAICS codes that use employee accounts, they have
to be small under the NAICS under the contract.

It is a base period of five years, one five-year option, so it'd be a, the code, the total term of the contract will be ten years. It is worldwide geographic scope, and allows for all contract types, which as you see in the evaluations because of the types of contracts, especially our experience on Alliant Small Business, you know, you'll see some emphasis on some types of contracts, especially cost

2.2

Page: 7 (25 - 28)

reimbursement contracts, primarily because upwards of more than 30 percent of our task order awards on Alliant Small Business have been cost reimbursement contracting. And that is by-the-book cost reimbursement contracting. It doesn't include time and materials, or labor hour, any of that.

So if we go to the next slide. All right. There you will see the proposal format as it's laid out in the RFP. What I would like to say first is that you will see in the RFP that we expect all of this to come into one package actually on one CD, all seven volumes.

There is one exception that we've made to this that you can't have separate CDs in the proposal. The only exception to this is, as we'll get into later with responsibility, is the fact that GSA Form 527, that form can actually be submitted by CTA partners whether, either JV or subcontractors to a prime. They can be sealed in individual envelopes in the proposal by themselves. Actually, the prime contractor

Page 25

doesn't have to even see them.

But having said that, we will not accept them separately. They have to be part of the offeror's proposal. In other words, they can't be sent in separately.

All right. Okay. First, I'm going to go, the way that I'm going to do this is I'm to just go through each volume just to kind of hit some of the highlights, hopefully answer some of the questions.

The first one on there is the Standard Form 33. I'm sure all of you guys saw that there was a mistake on that 33. It was the due date. It said August the 22nd. That is not the due date. The due date is August the 29th at 4:00 p.m. Central Time.

Just immediately after that was posted,
I saw that, and I subsequently uploaded to
FedBizOpps the corrected Standard From 33. So in
the announcement, look for the corrected 33 on
there that has the due date for the solicitation.

The document, probably, the most

Page 26

important document for us to see is the Document

Verification and Self-Scoring Worksheet. I think

it's J.P-1. The one thing I want to highlight

there is that we not only want as part of the

package the Excel spreadsheet of the J.P-1 as part

of the CD, but we also want to see one hard copy

of it on paper, and it can be just in the package.

That's the first thing that we're going to look at

as you'll see when we talk about in Section M of

how this is actually going to be evaluated.

The first thing we're actually going to pull out of the package before we look at anything is we're going to look at that paper score sheet to see what your score is on that, and then we're going to start lining them up from top to bottom, so make sure it matches.

The next thing on there is the meaningful relationship commitment letters. It could apply to small business, but it's mostly probably going to be applying to A2. The one way that I could see it applying to small businesses especially would be the ANCs. That's a

Page 27

possibility. But what that is, is that, if an offeror is using resources of another part of the organization whether it's a subsidiary, a division, if they're going to be using resources of that other part of the organization, that's what required in that is the meaningful relationship commitment letters, and the RFP actually spells out what those should be.

And as I mentioned earlier, the contractor teaming arrangements, the two types of CTAs that are now allowed on the contract would be a partnership, or a joint venture. You'll remember in the previous iterations of the first couple of drafts, it had to be existing.

Well, that's because of the NDAA 2016.

That's not the case anymore. They can be new JVs, and they can be new prime contractors proposing with a team of subcontractors.

There is, as far as CTAs, there is another one. This has caused a little bit of confusion and asked a number of questions about it. And that's the third one, the claiming prime Page 28

2.2

Page: 8 (29 - 32)

contractor relevant experience from an existing or previous joint venture or a partnership. What that means, and I think that the RFP is actually clear on it, is that a prime contractor that's not part of the JV, that's just offering as themselves, they can use experience where they performed as a member of a joint venture, and that's only if they were the only contractor that performed under that specific work for that joint venture.

There's some verification requirements. There's a document that majority of the members of the JVs sign off on and say, yes, this contractor performed 100 percent of the work under this work for the JV.

So that's one. That's the, that's also the only exception to the prime contract rule that we have, and I'll get into that just a little bit later.

And then the other ones are just, you can just read them for yourself up there. I'm not really going to, I haven't had any questions on

Page 29

them. It's just the Professional Employee

Compensation Plan, Uncompensated Overtime Policy,
and the reps and certs.

One thing I will say about the reps and certs is that if you're offering as a CTA, whether a prime with subs, or a joint venture, all the members of that CTA are going to have to submit their representations or certifications, which is pretty clear in the RFP.

Okay. Moving on to the relevant experience in Volume 2. We have our relevant experience, as you noticed, broken up into two different types of relevant experience. The primary one is the PSC experience, the product service code, product and service code experience. The other one is the leading edge technologies experience.

Our primary one is the PSC though. As far as your PSC experience, you can only use a project one time in PSC. You can't use it for multiple PSCs. Okay. And that PSC work has to be ongoing or completed within five years, and it has

to have at least one year of performance on it.

There are some exceptions to the one-year performance. If there's an interim or a final CPARS, it can be accepted. If there's a completed award fee determination, it can be accepted if it's less than a year.

And the last one, if the period of performance is less than a year, and the project is completed. Now, the value of projects under the PSC has to be at least \$1 million. You'll see, there is a pretty good explanation of how you determine the value of the project in the RFP that I'm really not going to elaborate on. I haven't had that many questions about it.

As far as the PSCs are concerned, we expect the contractors to use their reasonable discretion when they're determining whether or not a project would meet a particular PSC in the RFP. You know, our primary verification is FPDS- NG, which actually uses the PSC code, but just because it's not listed on the FPDS with that PSC code doesn't mean that the, that PSC, that type of work Page 31

wasn't integral to the project.

That's the key, is that it has to be integral to the project, and we had two separate verifications for the PSC. If -- I'm trying to make sure that I don't miss some of these questions that's have been asked.

Our primary way of verifying the information for the PSC, especially for, even for the extra points on the PSC, because each of those points can be found on an FPDS-NG report, that is our primary way. If FPDS-NG report exists, and it's complete, and verifies all of it, that is our primary verification, and we're going to take that at face value. The only things that you submit in those instances is the FPDS report itself. We still require a copy of the statement of work under that, and we, anytime we require a statement of work, and this is going to apply to both PSC and LETs, if we require a statement of work, we're asking you to highlight those areas where that, with emphasis on that PSS, and, actually, when I get into the LETs too, are where that LET is being Page 32

2.2

2.1

Page: 9 (33 - 36)

performed. And we also want even if FPTS-NG verifies everything, we want you to fill out the ${\tt J.P-2}$ Form, the PSC template.

Okay. If the FPDS-NG is not available, that doesn't mean that you can't use that, that project for that PSC. It just has to go through some other verification requirements. Not only do you have to send in the Form J.P- 2, but you have to also, we also are requiring that a contracting officer, a warranted contracting officer, signs off on it, and says, yes, that was a part of this project.

We do allow for a COR. The default is the ordering contracting officer. Not the ordering contracting officer, but the contracting officer, the warranted cognizant contracting officer for that project. That's the default. If they are not available, we will accept a signature from a contracting officer's representative.

And I've had a number of questions about what about COTRs. Well, OMB first when they come out with the training and the certification

Page 33

requirements for CORs, it originally was a contracting officer's technical representative. But they kind of made the COTR obsolete when they were revised that memorandum. So it is a contracting officer's representative now. So if it's a COTR, or if it's COR, we would look at that as synonymous. It's as long as they meet the requirements that are in the RFP that the information that we're asking for.

Now, of course, you're always going to have to, you're required to submit the statement of work, especially if the FPDS is not complete or it's incomplete and the form.

The other thing that I would like to mention is the -- oh, man, just flittered away. Anyways, it'll pop back in my head.

Okay. There are some other things.

There's additional points that can be for the PSC projects that, as you've seen in Section M, there's additional points to be had.

Oh, here's what I was going to say. I knew it'd pop back in my head. The PSC codes, we

are not asking you to ask the contracting officer to make any kind of changes in FPDS-NG. That contracting officer has put that PSC code in. We don't expect them to change it. That's why we have other verification routes that you can take if that's not the primary PSC.

Now, as far as the others that you can gain points, the first one was the project size and complexity. You get varying points if it's from 2 million up to 5 million, 5 million up to 15 million, and greater than 15 million. You can get additional points for projects that meet those criteria.

There is another change that was from our draft RFPs. As far as the demonstrating experience with multiple federal government customers, we had switched from a listing that we had in the draft RFPs of the agencies that you could get credit for, and we've just gone to funding agency ID, which is found in FPDS-NG.

So it does open up more opportunities to gather those points because there's a lot more

Page 35

funding agencies than there are in our list. So that was one of the changes that we made from the draft RFPs.

The next one is the, a project with cost reimbursement. The cost reimbursement, the one thing that I want to tell you is time and material, and labor hour type contracts

,<inaudible>. This is FAR Part 16 cost
reimbursement

type contract, and everything that that means. So if you do demonstrate experience in cost reimbursement contracts, and some of the PSCs fall into that category, you will get extra points for that.

Fair opportunity task order award against a MA IDIQ contract, this is a 16.505 type of a task order where fair opportunity was provided, and it was competed. If that's the case, then you get the points. It's not a FAR Part 8, and we will not, schedule, competed schedule awards and such we will not accept. It has to be a multiple award, IDIQ contract for you Page 36

to get those points.

2.2

The reason for that is, is that's because that's what this contract is. We're looking for experience with contractors that have actually had multiple award IDIQ contracts such as Alliant SB or the other GWACs that are out there.

The other thing I'd like to say, for the last three that I mentioned, the fair opportunity task order award against a MA IDIQ, contract project with cost reimbursement, and demonstrating experience with multiple federal government customers, there's only one way to verify that, and that is FPDS-NG. If it cannot be verified by FPDS-NG, you will not get the points for that.

The other one is the project in a foreign location. The one thing that I would like to say about -- actually, a couple of things I would like to say about that.

The first one is that as the RFP says, a foreign location as defined in our RFP, is that as far as the United States is concerned, it's the 48 contiguous states. It's Alaska, it's Hawaii, and

Page 37

it's territories and possessions.

For you to get credit for foreign work, it has to be outside of that. So it's outside of USA and all of it's possessions. So that's the one thing.

The second thing about the foreign location is that it can be verified by FPDS-NG, but we're not requiring that it be verified by FPDS-NG. If there was a significant piece of that work that was overseas, even though it's coded as primarily in the United States, you can get credit for that. It's just that we have the verification requirements that are in the contract. And part of that has to do with, you know, highlighting statements of work, or whatever, showing that that work being performed overseas.

And this work cannot be TDY. It can't be just traveling overseas for a particular project. It has to be boots on the ground, working in those foreign locations on an ongoing basis.

In the PSC Code Table, I've gotten a lot

PSCs, and definitions, and such. We are not going to do that. The RFP states that the Federal Procurement Data System Product and Service Codes Manual is what governs in this. And there's not going to be anymore information than what's in that. That's why I was talking about earlier about using your reasonable discretion about determining whether a PSC would fit in a particular, in a particular relevant experience slot.

of questions about wanting us to elaborate on

Page: 10 (37 - 40)

Leading edge technology relevant experience. That verification really kind of goes, it's pretty much in line with the verification on the PSC if you don't, if the FPDS is incomplete.

As far as the LETs are concerned, once again, it's just like the PSC. It had to have been integral to the performance of the project. Once again just like in PSCs, it can only be used one time in the LETs, but there's, you do have one big advantage. There's only one exception to

Page 39

being able to use a project twice is that you can use -- in the PSC you can have up to seven projects. It's four in the PSC, the first section, it's two in second section, it's one in the third section. A total of seven projects. You can use each one of those PSCs one time in the LETs, so you could get up to seven instances if it happens to hit one of those LETs. You can get up to seven instances that you can reuse that PSC in the LET, but you can only use it once.

Once, again, it's that same verification process that we talked with the PSC - statements of work, highlighted area in the statements of work, award forms. Each one of these requires award form, statements of work, sign-off on the contracting officer, if the contracting officer is not available a COR will work.

Okay. And the one area in LETs where you get extra points is the breadth of LETs that you hit. It has to be individual LETs. It can't be multiple, you know, you can have up to three

experience citations in each leading edge

Page 40

2.2

Page: 11 (41 - 44)

dth. 3

Yeah. And the other, if there is

y,

4 negative past performance, we do allow for you to

ually

5 do a one-page summary on that negative past

6 performance to give your side of it.

send in.

There was, I know, in the proposal tables in the beginning of it, it was, had mentioned the double-side and stuff, kind of ambiguous about whether it was one page or not. It is one page, and that will be another that will be fixed.

I'm actually kind of running out of time, so we'll move on. Okay. On the system certifications and clearances, the one thing that I want to say here is that this is, especially affects those that are offering as a CTA, or whether joint venture with members, or whether a prime and subcontractor. Under these certifications and clearances, they all have to be in the name of the prime contractor. We won't accept certifications from any subcontractors, or Page 43

1 just individual members of a JV.

There is one exception. If it's a joint venture, either the JV itself can have the certification, or if each individual member of that joint venture has that certification, it can be used. So that is important.

Okay. As far as the cost accounting system and audit information, this is actually a big change from the original Alliant Small Business solicitation. I don't know if any of you guys remember, but that was actually a go-no go. What we have now is just a scoring. It's just additional points if you do have it.

But what's required is that the contractor has to have had an accounting system that had been audited and determined adequate for cost reimbursement contracting by DCAA, DCMA, or any other agency or cognizant auditing agency.

Typically, as you guys know, it's usually a, it's associated with a cost reimbursement type work, whether it's a task order or a contract. GSA is not going to be sponsoring Page 44

technology. Multiple within a leading edge technology doesn't count as breadth, but across leading edge technologies does count as breadth.

The other thing is that I would say,
don't, I wouldn't spend my time when you actually
put questions on index cards about typos, or
problems like that because I've been made well
aware of it.

As my colleague on A2 said, they are just what he considered artifacts from all the draft RFPs that we've had, so I tried to catch all of those. Apparently, I didn't catch them all, but I've already got them highlighted. There will be an amendment to actually make those changes.

I say that now because I know on the J.P-1 that it's not scoring correctly. It's not adding one of them up. So all of that will be fixed, and it will be coming on an amendment later. And you'll find the descriptions of the LETs as one of our proposal attachments, at J.P-4.

Okay. On our past performance, what we require is we require a past performance from each

Page 41

one of the PSC relevant experience that you're actually citing in your proposal.

As far as the past performance is concerned, we're going to rely on PPIRS. If a PPIRS's past performance exists, what we require is that the most current one is sent in, and that's really actually it's for the verification for the past performance on that PSC. We do allow — if a PPIRS report does not exist, then we do allow for you to use a form. It's J.P-5, the past performance template, that you can give to your customer that they can actually fill out and rate.

It follows strictly in line with the same rating evaluation factors that is found in PPIRS, and will be used the same way as PPIRS is.

Those have to be as part of your, they can't be sent in separately from customers. It has to be part of your package. So you're going to have to send that out to your customer. That customer is going to have to send it back to you, and you're going to have to send it in. We won't accept them, we won't accept anything outside of Page 42

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

that.

different areas.

Page: 12 (45 - 48) then you get the points. There's nothing else you have to do. The other one is a joint venture, or it

Standard Form 1408, whether it's the audit report 4 could be a partnership or a joint venture, or a itself, anything that shows us unequivocally that 5 your accounting systems have been audited and 6 determined adequate for cost reimbursement 7 contracting, then you will be able to get those 8

2

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

that.

prime contractor and it's proposed first tier subcontractor team. That is the business arrangement.

points. But it is just points. It doesn't keep anybody from competing. You know, there may be other ways that offerors can gather up points in

any of these audits. These audits just have to

documentation that we ask for, whether it's a

exist. If they exist and you provide the

clarified. Previously performed. There's actually two words in there that have a lot of meaning that just may not on the face of it seem that way. What we mean by previously is previous to the issue of the RFP. That's what previously means, and that amendment will actually clarify

Okay. Here's what needs to be

But that's a big deal. Used to you couldn't even, in the old Alliant Small Business, you couldn't even compete, but at least you now can compete if you don't have those, don't have

What we mean by perform is we mean work that is being performed. If a subcontract has simply been signed, but there's been no work performed under that subcontract, then that won't count. So when you see the term, "previously performed, " that means previous to the RFP being issued, and, "performed," means performance under

Page 47

The other things, the forward pricing rate agreements, the earned value management systems, acceptable estimating systems, all of those certifications, I mean, for lack of a better term, they just are what they are. I mean, you Page 45

that subcontract.

have the documents that show that you have that certification, and depending on what levels you have, you will get the additional points for

having those certifications.

The other thing, many questions about whether the prime contractor that's proposing can, could they have been a subcontract to their subcontractor? And the answer to that is no. It has to be the prime, if it's a prime contractor and a subcontractors, that any work that was done had to have been performed in a prime sub relationship with a prime contractor proposing on the RFP was the prime contractor and that prime sub -- I'm even confusing myself.

You can go to the next one. Okay. This was another area that was kind of born out of the NDAA 2016. As you know, now we're allowing newly-formed joint ventures, newly-formed prime contractors, and a team of subcontractors.

> The prime contractor had to have been the prime contractor in the prime sub relationship if there was a previous relationship there.

But what we've added is an organizational risk assessment within the contract, within the RFP. There's going to be, there will be an amendment to this. It's not a, it possibly could be a significant amendment to some of you, but it's just, it's really going to be a, it's a clarification on our part.

Okay. A business arrangement is considered to have previously performed if one of the following conditions is met. Of course, an individual company, nothing else needs to be said, they get the points.

What we meant when we wrote it, but it may not be clear, for the purposes of this evaluation factor, a business arrangement is defined as an individual company. If an individual company is proposing as itself, not using subcontractors, not part of a joint venture,

A joint venture has previously performed work on a contract or an order. That is an existing joint venture that existed prior to Page 48

2.2

issuing the RFP, and that has done work under other contracts successfully.

The other one is that as far as the prime and a subcontractor arrangement, a prime subcontractor arrangement would be considered to have previously performed, each proposed subcontractor has previously performed on a contract or order as a subcontractor to the offering prime contractor. If that is the case, then they can actually get the points as far as the organizational risk assessment.

Okay. As far as the cost price is concerned, I think it's pretty straight forward. Just remember, I've had a lot of questions about the rates, and not understanding especially that range of rates that we're talking about proposing under, those are direct labor rates. That's what the employee is getting paid. It has no fringe benefits on it. It has no overhead. No G&A. It's just the direct rate that the contractor, I mean, that the employee is being paid. That's what those rates represent.

Page 49

2.2

Those rates were, we went through a lot of research in developing those rates. The only thing, just the major things that I'd want to say about that is that you want to be very careful, we're not telling you can't propose outside of those rates, either lower or higher, but we just want to caution you that you do that at your own peril.

If you do do that, just make sure that you submit all of the justifications and stuff that we ask you to. If you go beyond, either above or below our rates, we ask that you supplement that with some kind of explanation as to why you did that.

The other thing, there's a couple of other things that you would have to explain to us if you do something outside of what we've asked for. We've, actually, set a, it's not a ceiling profit because you can propose whatever profit you want to understanding that these rates only apply to time and material, and labor hour type task orders.

We've set a target rate of 7.5 percent. If you propose something higher than that, that would require a justification as to why you did that.

Page: 13 (49 - 52)

The other justification would be is if on the indirect rates, what we're asking you on your indirect rates because part of this cost submittal, this pricing submittal, is a basis of estimates where you give us, you know, how you estimate things, and how you do it with your, you know, your audited rates, and forward pricing rates, and such as that, we ask you to do that same thing when you, actually, put in your overhead rates in the spreadsheet. We would ask that you would explain something that goes outside of your normal business practices as far as using those audited rates.

The other thing that I'd like to let you know is that on that spreadsheet, you only put, you're only putting one year's worth of, in there, and you're putting, you're putting your rates for one year, your overhead for that one year, and

Page 51

it's being extrapolated out. The spreadsheet will automatically extrapolate that out. It's escalating it now at 1.8 percent per year, which is it was, we actually, that annual escalation is the current BLS/BCI three-year average, which is right now at 1.8, we will do an adjustment at the option period when we get to the option period for the awardees on the contract. We will do another analysis of the three previous analysis years, and we'll adjust the rates in the years 5 through 10 on that. There is a government site and a contractor site spreadsheet.

Now, the other thing about the indirect rates that you put on the spreadsheet. We have allowed, most of our templates don't allow you to put any information in except for what we want you to put the information in, we have allowed on our spreadsheets if you have a peculiar or a different kind of overhead rates, or, you know, just something very specific to your company, you can adjust the columns under the indirect rates to add more columns to it, or, you know, if you had Page 52

2.2

specific needs to do that, we have addressed that so that you can put your company overhead in the spreadsheet.

You can go to the next one. As far as the responsibility is concerned, as far as your offer that you submit, under the responsibility Volume 7, that's where you're submitting your GSA Form 527s. There's a couple of things that I want to make note of that, and this is through our financial office that actually looks at these. Just be very diligent to put in the exact name that's in your Articles of Incorporation, or however your company, whatever the full title of your company is, you need to put that in. It's not IBM. It's International Business Machines. You want to put it in there exactly as it is legally, because sometimes they get rejected for some odd reasons, and most of the time that's what it is, so I'd ask you to be diligent about putting the correct name in there.

The other thing is, is that this is the one exception that it doesn't have to be in one

Page 53

2.1

CD, in one file. We will allow for financial information from subcontractors and a prime sub teaming relationship, or in joint ventures, we will allow those to be in sealed envelopes within the package if those subcontractors or joint venture members want that to stay confidential, but they cannot be sent in separately. They have to be part of the package.

So what we would expect to see would be a package with the offeror's proposal in it, and maybe several sealed envelopes within that with their CDs, with that 527 in there. Don't ask me if I'll adjust that because I won't. Just accept it. It has to be part of the package.

Okay. A little bit about the source selection. One of the reasons that, I wanted to make it very clear to you guys to make sure your paper copy, that JP-1, self- scoring worksheet and validation worksheet, make sure it's accurate, and reflects what's, what the, the file that's on your disk, the Excel file, because that's what we're initially going to rank the offerors. So that

hard copy, just make sure it's correct. It's got the correct score, the score that you intend to be submitting.

Page: 14 (53 - 56)

The source selection process on the Alliant2 Small Business GWAC will neither be based on the lowest price technically acceptable, nor tradeoff. Within the best value continuum, FAR 15.101 defines best value as using any other, any one, or a combination of source selection approaches for the master contract. The highest technically rated offerors with a fair and reasonable price will determine the best value for contract awards.

So we're making awards. It's possible it could be more than 80, but the only way that it would be more than 80 is if we got a tie at the 80th position. If we had two tie 80, then there would be 81 contractor awards. Ties within previous to the last 80, if we have a tie at 39, one of those offerors is going to take th 39th position. One of those offerors is going to take the 40th position. So the only tie that counts is Page 55

the tie at the 80th position.

So we are making 80 awards, and that's firm. As the RFP says, if there is a single point difference, it doesn't make any difference to us. If there's a single point difference between Offeror 80, and Offeror 81, only Offeror 80 is getting an award. It's clear in the RFP, and that's what we intend to do.

On the next slide -- actually, I just, I put a picture up there of a chart that's, actually, in Section M of the contract. It just spells out all the points that are for each one of the scoring elements.

You can go to the next one. And it just continues.

And I think that we've reached our break. I've kind of gone over a little bit, kind of ate into some of you guys questions.

I know this is probably the most important piece of it because you're going to be able to ask us questions on the index cards.

We'll be gathering, we're going to take a little

Page 56

break. We'll be gathering up those index cards. questions right now, so he may bring me some We'll kind of sort through them a little bit, and, others that he'd like for me to answer. 2 of course, we won't be able to get through every And I'm seeing these questions for the 3 3 first time, so, all right. May a small business question, but we're going to sort through them, 4 4 bid on both Alliant SB and Alliant Unrestricted? see the ones that interest us the most, the one 5 5 that might clarify something that's unusual, and These are two separate contracts. You 6 6 might bring mistakes to our part. 7 can bid on both contracts. It's just that Anyways, that is it, and we're going to Alliant, the Alliant2 contract is just an 8 8 take a break when we can take those questions. unrestricted full and open competition. It's open 9 9 MR. COLE: Yeah, try to be back at I for small businesses and other than small 10 10 would say 25 after, 25 after the hour. businesses to compete. So they're in the same 11 11 program, but they are two separate and distinct (Recess) 12 12 13 MR. COLE: All right. Do we have all 13 contracts. So, yes, you can. the index cards? Even though you guys you put We got a number of these questions, and 14 14 your questions on the index cards, please make they're also, I tried to answer in the 15 15 sure to go to a2sb@gsa.gov and resubmit those presentation that I gave you, but I'll answer it 16 16 questions. We do want to record every question we again. 17 17 get. They are going to all be considered, and the This has to do with the extra points for 18 18 feedback will be posted on fedbizopps, and the fair opportunity MA, ID (off mic). 19 19 number of questions and responses that were posed The two question in here is does SeaPort 20 20 count, and does IT Schedule 70 count. on febizopps, so keep your eyes on that. 21 21 You ready to rock and roll? All right. I can say IT Schedule 70 does not count. 22 22 Page 57 Page 59 That is a FAR Part 8 federal supply schedule Here's Greg to do what he can with those 1 1 questions. contract. What we're interest in is we're 2 2 (Applause) interested in getting the extra points because you 3 3 4 (Laughter) 4 have experience working with contracts such as MR. BYRD:: I've got a pair of GWACs that are multiple award IDIQ contracts, 5 5 reading glasses. All right. As we said earlier, which are totally separate and distinct from 6 6 we're not going to be able to get through all federal supply schedule contracts. 7 7 these questions. And some of you guys submitted As far as the SeaPort E, if it's a 8 8 some good questions that are very nuanced, 9 multiple award IDIQ contract, and it's coded in 9 requires a little bit of a research. We're not FPDS that way, and fair opportunity was provided 10 10 going to be answering those questions off the cuff under a task order that you're trying to get extra 11 11 12 up here. But we will consider them because, you 12 points for, if fair opportunity was provided for under FAR 16.505, and it shows that Fair 13 know, it makes us think sometimes, and we go back 13 and we'll consider those questions. 14 opportunity was done on the FPDS-NG report, then 14 So if you don't, don't be discouraged if it will count. 15 15 you don't hear an answer to your question. There It does not have to be a GWAC per se. 16 16 will be, there'll probably, there'll at least be It just has to be a multiple award, indefinite 17 17 one round of questions and answers that will be delivery, indefinite quantity contract that 18 18 posted at FedBizopps, probably multiple rounds provides for a fair opportunity. 19 19 because there usually is. So I'm going to just Please clarify whether a newly-awarded 20 20 start answering some of these questions. contract on an IDIQ with no task orders yet 21 21

Page: 15 (57 - 60)

Page 58

22

awarded will qualify to support previous

Page 60

Matt's, actually, going through the

22

performance in the business relationship prime subcontractor?

2.2

The very specific answer to that as I tried to say in the presentation that I gave, the specific answer to that is no, it won't, because we consider performance the two prongs was the previous and the performance. Performance means performance. That's you've actually performed the work under it.

Does a competitive award on GSA Schedule 70 count towards fair opportunity? That's no.

Are there plans to develop a consolidated forecast for acquisition under the A2SB vehicle? The only thing that I would say about that is that the GWAC is available for our customers to use. We promote those contracts. We don't typically develop forecasts because it's almost impossible for us to do that because of all the various agencies that use our contract. We'd have to coordinate with each of one them which doesn't happen. It's just a contract that our customers can use.

Page 61

Actually, I meant to answer this one in the presentation, but I didn't, so I'm glad I got this question.

If a company is priming, can they also sub to another prime? And the answer to that is yes. We're not prohibiting a prime contractor from being a subcontractor on another prime contractor's prime and sub team. So, yes, you can do that.

Has GSA established the point scale they are looking for so SBs can make a go-no go decision? Unfortunately for the go-no go decision, we're not coming up with any point scales or minimum points. It's just going to be the top 80 contractors. I know that's difficult as far as your guys trying to make a bid, no-bid decision because it's with just the number of small businesses that might be interested in submitting a proposal, yeah, it could be difficult.

 $$\operatorname{But}$ at least when the Alliant2 Small Business is awarded, you'll have more of a picture ${\tt Page} \ \ 62$

of what those points would take, what it would take to win. But, no, don't have any minimum points.

Page: 16 (61 - 64)

Can companies offer statements that SAM data is current and accurate in lieu of certsand reps in Section K?

I think that we actually had the clause checked in there. I think it's D of that clause that if the reps and certs are completed and done, then that's what we will use is the sam.gov.

The next question is will double points be considered for both CMMI Development 3, and CMMI Services 3? No, I think the way that the CMMI is contemplated right now is just that it's Level 2 or greater. You get a number of points if you have a Level 2, and you get an greater number of points if you have a Level 3. You don't add them together, but you get more points if it's Level 3, and we don't have it divided up for service and development. So you only get one set of points. No double point.

Again, can a small business submit a bid

Page 63

as a prime, and also be a subcontractor on another bid? And the answer to that's, yes.

If a prime sub team has won a contract, but no task order yet, will this still be considered previous performance? If there no work, there's no performance.

Do all subcontractors need to have worked together, or just need to have with the prime? Yeah, this is an important question because it can be confusing.

If it's a prime subcontractor team, the requirement is that that prime contractor has had, has awarded a subcontract to each one of its subcontractors. They don't have to perform as a team. It's just that each subcontractor has to have been a subcontractor to that prime contractor previous, on previous performance. Performance before the RFP was issued.

And that's, and also, that's just to get, that's not, that's not a requirement. It's just to get the extra points for the, the risk assessment, yes. It's not a requirement in the Page 64

2.2

12/10 PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE

If an offeror is unable to obtain CO or COR signature for an LET reference, will the government allow a signature from the respective government contracting office?

proposal. It's just the additional points.

I can answer. If you are able to get the contracting office that has cognizance over that task order or contract that you're trying to use for PSC experience, and for some reason the CO is not available, and the COR is not available that works specifically on that project, if you can get a contracting officer, or a contracting office manager, or whatever, that is responsible for that contractor task order to sign off on that, we will accept that.

But it still would have to be a contracting officer, or a contracting officer's representative because that office has cognizance over that work, so they would know.

And usually, the office manager is typically a contracting. If they're not a contracting officer, then you couldn't get that

Page 65

signature.

So I want to make it perfectly clear.

It's a contracting officer, or it's a COR, if the contracting officer is not available. And they, those signatures can come from the office that is responsible for that work.

Under the Fair Opportunity Task Order, the RFP does not specifically state that the contract has to be GWAC. It just states multiple award IDIQ. That said, would contracts such as FAA E fast, a multiple award contract specifically for FAA be considered a multiple award IDIQ, and receive points?

It may. I'm just not familiar with that contract. This is not GWAC experience. This is, you know, there's only a handful of GWACs out in the government. This is experience with a multiple award IDIQ contract where fair opportunity was provided for the task order, all found in 16.505. If the contract is that type of contract, and FPDS, remember that the only way to verify this is FPDS-NG.

If FPDS-NG identifies it as a multiple award IDIQ contract, and that contracting officer checked off that fair opportunity was provided for, then it will count. It doesn't have to be a GWAC per se.

Page: 17 (65 - 68)

For the leading edge technologies, can you use a project that you were a subcontractor? All of the work under the, this is actually, this is actually a great question. Probably something that next time I'll bring up in the presentation, if I didn't.

It actually was, I think it confused some people because I got a number of questions concerning this, because there's a statement right up front about all of the work has to be done as a prime contractor. What is meant by that statement, that's a true statement. Even if you're a subcontractor on a prime subcontracting team, and you're using that subcontractor's work as relevant experience project, that work performed by that subcontractor had to be as a prime contractor. Could not be a subcontractor.

Page 67

So all of the work that is performed, all of the relevant experience work that you're citing has to have been performed as a prime contractor. There's only one exception to that. The only exception to that is the piece in there about being able, a prime contractor can count work that they perform under a joint venture where they were the only joint venture performing the work that gets verified by the other joint venture members. That's the only exception to the prime contractor rule.

So all subs, all members of joint ventures on CTAs that we're allowing now, any work that's cited for a relevant experience project, that work had to have been done by that entity as a prime contractor.

Some of you write bigger than others. Under previous performance, it states that a copy of the subcontract is required. Does a valid subcontract on an awarded IDIQ vehicle, which is not awarded task orders as of yet qualify?

I think I answered that in a previous,

Page 68

2.2

2.1

performance means performance. That you have to perform.

And Matt put these together. I think he wants me to keep reiterating that for some reason. As it relates to Volume 2, relevant experience, L.5.2.2.6, PSC Group relevance experience project in a foreign location. What is the minimum -- oh. What is the minimum duration for which the project should have been OCONUS?

We don't have it. Here's the way that I would put that. We would, just like on the PSCs, we're asking the contractors to use their discretion, reasonable discretion in determining whether or not, for instance, a PSC needs a relevant, a project needs a relevant PSC experience.

If you highlight it, show us where it is in the statement of work, and we agree with you that it does show that work is being done under it, then we're good with that.

It's the same thing with the foreign location. We expect to be, use your reasonable

Page 69

discretion if you're going to use a project to try to get the foreign location points, you already know that you can't use TDY, you can't use just trips to see, you know, very short-term trips. Has to be people working in a foreign location.

We don't put any minimum duration on it. It just, you just use your discretion. If you think it's a foreign location, and we don't think it's a foreign location, then we would, it would be clear on the face of it that it's not work that was done in a foreign location, just frankly.

So you use your discretion. If it's work in a foreign location on a task order, or a contract, then that's it. It would be, more than likely be good with us unless it's just egregiously not. No TDY (inaudible).

As it relates to Volume 5, would this requirement be of the prime in a prior business relationship not specifically with the Alliant team members?

Okay. Would the government consider allowing experience for leading edged technologies as a subcontractor? And the answer to that is, no.

Page: 18 (69 - 72)

Is past performance of a member of a joint venture considered for the joint venture? The answer to that is, yes. And then we are allowing under, under the CTA that's now in the RFP, whether it's prime subcontractors or a joint venture, that past performance performed by each member of the joint venture, or each subcontractor under a prime in a subcontracting relationship can count as relevant experience, which in the PSCs would flow down to past performance.

Now, this is a great question too because it actually says to be determined. Okay. And it will be fixed in an amendment. What contract start date should we use to complete the price template?

The RFP as it stands right now says to be determined, which doesn't help you guys very much. You know, these awards, they'll probably be $\mbox{Page }71$

made within a year. When it all boils down to it, the proposals are due -- I can give you -- here's what I'll say. The RFP rules. And whatever amendment comes out and says it is rules. This is what's considered an off-the-cuff remark. It just makes sense to me.

So if -- and I'll talk to my colleagues about it when we get through. We expect to make the awards within a year. The proposals are due on August the 29th. What I would expect probably it'll be somewhere in the range of September, October 1st of the following year is when you would start those prices. It could be, it'll probably, it may be different from that by a month, maybe a few months before or a few months after we all get together. But it'll be, it'll be some date in the future probably, you know, next year, fourth quarter, fiscal year fourth quarter, or first question of the next fiscal year.

So we'll have that. But just for your own, you'll know. You'll know before the proposals are due about when you should, when we Page 72

would expect the start date for the pricing to be. information in a CPAR's report, if CPARs feeds If you have a PSC project that uses more PPIRS and a contracting officer has gone through 2 than one LET, please confirm that you can only use CPARs and put in the performance, the past 3 3 the PSC project one time in the LET section. 4 performance on a project -- huh? 4 SPEAKER: (Off mic). That is a true statement. You can use 5 5 each PSC project one time in the LETs. So if you, MR. BYRD:: : Yeah, it feeds PPIRS. It 6 6 if you filled all PSC projects up, that means that 7 would be in PPIRS. Thank you, Alex. I should have figured that out on my own. you would have seven relevant experience in the 8 8 PSC. (Pause) 9 9 You possibly could, if all seven of MR. BYRD:: : How much time do we have? 10 10 those reached LETs also, it's possible that you I've got a food for thought. GSA stated that if 11 11 can be able to use seven PSCs in the LET. But, two companies tie at spot number 39, then one of 12 12 yes, you can, but you can only use them one time. them will get spot number 40. What will GSA do if 13 13 Say, it would be a maximum of seven PSCs that you 14 20 companies tied spot number 60? 14 could also use in the LET. 15 15 (Laughter). Task orders under a BPA. I assume each MR. BYRD:: : Will GSA ignore all those 16 16 individual task order could be used for either a bidders who may without a tie be at spot number 17 17 PSC example, or an LET example? 61, or 62, or 80? Will they not be considered for 18 18 I'm going to hold off on that question an award? Clarify ties at the 80th position. All 19 19 for a second. 20 right. 20 To receive credit for a task order Okay. If 20 offerors tie at the 60th 21 21 position, those 20 offerors would get an award and 2.2 awarded against a MAIDIO, can the awarded task 22 Page 73 Page 75 order be less than one year old? we would make 80 awards. Number 81 would not get 1 Well, to receive credit for a task order an award. 2 2 awarded against a MAIDIQ has to be one of the Yeah, if you want to clarify it even 3 3 4 projects in the PSC. I mean, that's all we're 4 further, that if ties before the 80th position run using for these additional points. past the 80th position, then all of those ties 5 5 The requirement for the PSC relevant would, let's just say that ties in the last 6 6 experience project is that it has to be more than position will all get an award. If you had 50 tie 7 7 a year old except for those three exceptions. If at number 20, then all 50 of those would get an 8 8 award, if all 50 tied at 60. So all ties --9 there's a completed PPIRS, there's an award fee 9 determination, or if the period of performance was (Laughter) 10 10 less than a year, and it was completed. It also MR. BYRD:: : I'm just going to move 11 11 12 has to meet the minimum value requirements of the 12 on. Okay. We had been audited by DCAA, but never PSC, which is a million dollars. 13 13 received a report. Will we receive credit for the So the answer to that is it depends. It 14 DCAA audit? We never received a report since DCAA 14 can be less than a year old if it meets one of sent the report directly to the agency. 15 15 those three exceptions, and it would only be able We actually have a, we have a way to 16 16 to be used if it was one of the PSCs and the value verify that. Hopefully, before you use the 17 17 of it was greater than \$1 million. 18 secondary way to verify, hopefully, you can speak 18 Since the Department of Defense is such with that agency that you're doing that work for 19 19 a large customer of the Alliant GWACs, can CPARs and obtain a copy of that report, or anything that 20 20 be used in place of PPIRS for past performance? shows that your accounting systems have been 21 2.1

Page: 19 (73 - 76)

Page 74

22

audited and determined adequate for cost

Page 76

CPARs actually feeds PPIRS. If the

22

reimbursement contracting?

2.2

Hopefully, you can get that report. And from experience on the original Alliant Small Business, for the most part, they all were sent in with the offeror, so they were most able to obtain them, or they already had them themselves.

There's actually a very specific section in there that if you know you've been audited, and if you've been awarded a cost reimbursement contract, or a task order, you know you've been audited, you know your accounting systems have been determined adequate for cost reimbursement contracting because you're working on one right now but you just don't have the report or the documentation that you need, then you give us the name, all of the contact information for that DCAA office, the names of auditors, names and phone numbers, and we will make the call and verify that if you don't have it.

But what we request is that you try to get it because that just adds additional work, and additional time in getting the contracts awarded

Page 77

and having to verify. It's much easier if it's in the package.

And from past experience, I know that you can get it because 95 percent of them submitted it with their proposals on the original Alliant Small Business.

So, yes, there is a way. If you know it's been done, there is a way for us to verify that.

Why are we having small business meet

DCAA requirement who never had Cost Plus fixed fee

contract? Would please you accept a CPA letter

instead showing that our accounting system is in

compliance, and ready for a Cost Plus fixed fee?

Well, let me say this. We're not going to allow for a CPA audits or individual CPA audits for firms for those that don't have. The requirement is, it's there, and there's a purpose for it. What we're interested in is awarding contacts at least to a preponderance of our contractors on Alliant2 Small Business that have cost reimbursement contracting experience. And

small businesses do a lot of cost reimbursement contracting. We just know from history from even on our Alliant Small Business contract GWAC, it's more than 30 percent, I mean, that's one of the most popular reasons why the Alliant Small Business GWAC is so popular is that it allows for that cost reimbursement contacting. It's especially important for our DOD customers.

Page: 20 (77 - 80)

So it's important for us to have contractors on the contract, at least a preponderance of them, that had that cost reimbursement experience so that on Day 1 when that contract is awarded, our customers know that they can use that contract and be assured that they're going to have contractors that can compete for their work. That's why we put so much emphasis on cost reimbursement contacting.

We did take it out of a go-no go situation. It is, now it's just additional points that you can acquire under the, in the RFP.

So we're firm on that. You can continue asking the question if you want. It is pretty

Page 79

firm, and we're gonna stick to it. When we say cost accounting system, it's gonna be directly related to work that you're doing on a cost reimbursement contract or task order.

And if that's taking place, and it's a requirement of a FAR that that shall be entered into unless the contractors' accounting systems have been audited and determined adequate for cost reimbursement contracting.

And the FAR actually designates DCAA as the cognizant auditing agency for all of the federal government, even though they're having some pipeline problems that's still in the FAR, but other agencies also.

It's, you know, it's ultimately the contracting officer's responsibility to do that, but they rely on the auditors to do those financial audits of those systems.

For the most part, the CO's not in a position to do that, and that's why the far spells out the -- we do, you can be audited by other cognizant agencies that can audit your accounting

Page 80

Page: 21 (81 - 84)

systems.

2.2

Some agencies may have their own auditors, and do it themselves, those audits, just so long as it's in relation to a cost reimbursement contractor task order, and your accounting systems have been audited and determined adequate for cost reimbursement contracting, then you will gain the additional points. But it's not a go-no go factor as it used to be in the past.

I will say one thing though. You will notice on things in the RFP where it does mention a CPA. There is one instance where we're asking, that we will ask for a supplement from a certified public accountant.

The one instance when we would do that, and it's to supplement information that exists.

If the audit has been more than five years ago, then the offeror must submit that with a CPA basically saying that no material changes have been made to the accounting system since the last audit. But that doesn't negate the fact that an

audit has to exist. It's just a little stale. It's over five years.

Are awardees grandfathered in as a small for the entire life of the contract regardless and exceeding the small business threshold? Thanks.

Well, there's multiple ways to answer that question. There's a re-representation on long-term contracts. This is a long-term contract. It's over five years. It's two instances when a contractor has to re- represent their size status.

One of them is a merger and acquisition. In the contract, actually, we really didn't go much to the contract because most people are interested in the, in the proposal itself, but in the contract it says, "If by merger or acquisition a company becomes other than small, they are removed from the contract." It's just a term and condition of the contract now.

Organic growth. If a small business organically grows in the first five years of the contract, they're going to remain small under the Page 82

contract at least through that five years even if they have organically grown to be other than small.

Page 81

At the five-year, before the sixth years of the contract, all contractors are going to have to re-represent their size status. When that happens, some of the contractors are going to be other than small. They're not going to be small businesses again.

Those other than small businesses, agencies can't get credit for small business anymore, but we do leave those contractors on a contract primarily because of our customers that have task orders with those contracts, contractors.

They won't be able to compete for new work in the option period, so they can't compete for new work, but they can finish task orders.

They can also, the only instances where they can be awarded new task orders are in instances where there is a limited, I think there's three exceptions to fair opportunity the agencies can Page 83

use and award a new order, and, primarily, we want to leave our customers the benefit of being able to use follow on to a previously- competed task order.

So that's why we leave them on the contract. They're just not able to compete for new work. So they won't -- to answer the question, they won't maintain their small business status on the contract for the life of the contract, just through the first five years.

How do you propose that we provide email evidence to a CO who is no longer with the government? RFP Section L.5.2.2.1.1, Verification of PSC Group Relevant Experience Submission.

I'll say that we understand that COs can move, and COs may not be there anymore. I think that what's most important about this that the CO is unavailable, it's like I said earlier with the office that has responsibility for that contract or that task order. I would just, if a previous CO to a work is just simply not available, or, you know, you can use a COR, but if they are not

Page 84

Anderson Court Reporting -- 703-519-7180 -- www.andersonreporting.net

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

7/12/16 PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE Page: 22 (85 - 88) for the contractors, and it's good for the ones available, your next step in that would be the office that's in charge of that relevant 2 that are left. MR. COLE: Greg, you have ten minutes. experience project. 3 If you can get a CO in that office, or a MR. BYRD:: : Okay. That long? 4 COR in that office to sign off on the information (Laughter) 5 to verify something, then we will accept that. MR. BYRD:: : If you propose a prime 6 And if it's, if it's talking about providing the 7 sub business relationship, can your subs past email in the situation where a COR, one of the performances as primes and themselves be used for 8 requirements that if you're going to use a COR to PSC or LET point credit? 9 sign off on it, then we have to have evidence that The answer to that's yes. That's what 10 they've submitted an email to the contracting it's allowing for now is that is that the, in a 11 prime/sub relationship, if you're proposing the office. We don't have to have a response to that 12 email. We just have to have evidence that a email 13 CTA is the prime, and a team of subcontractors, was sent making that CO aware that that COR is 14 then those subcontractors on that team can use actually verifying this information. their experience to fill PSC and LET slots as long 15 That email could go to a CO within the they did the work as a prime contractor, and as 16 office that has cognizance over that task order, long as it meets all the thresholds for the PSC 17 that contractor, that work, and that would be and the LET. So the answer to that's yes. 18 acceptable. Can a company bidding as a prime also be 19 Are there a Alliant 1 Small Business a sub on another bidder? And the answer is yes. 20 primes that have since outgrown the 541512 Can a member of a CTA, not the CTA team 21 that is bidding A2SB also bid? Yes. Also bid as (inaudible), and if so, can you 22 Page 85 Page 87 provide how many? Right now, we a prime? Yes. 1 had originally 73 awards. Task orders under a BPA, can these be 2 Through some mergers and acquisitions, used individually for LET experience if they meet 3 it got down to 68. There was five contracts that 4 all of the other criteria? were no cost terminations. At the option period, 5 The answer to that is, yes. When you option exercise where they re-represented, there have a lot of information in the RFP about what we 6 were 68 contractors, and I'm going to say 20 to 22 $\,$ defined as a relevant experience project, and I 7 of them grew to be other than small, don't have the RFP right up in front of me that's 8 re-represented themselves as other than small 9 very nuanced and detailed about what we consider business. And those contractors were, I mean, that relevant BPAs are mentioned in different ways 10 just, frankly, they just became wildly successful in there. 11 under Alliant Small Business. Got a lot of task 12 I mean, you can, if it's a single award order awards. They just grew. 13 BPA, or a single award IDIQ for a particular work

What is great about it is that they've grown, and they can't compete anymore on the contract. They're just completing task orders, or logical follow ons such as that.

There are remaining contractors, small business contractors, that really picked up the slack, and they're just -- it's continuing on. The contract is just as successful as it has been in the past, so it's actually been, it's been good and that they're just making calls on it, then you can have a collection of them, can be, there's a lot of, if you just read the RFP, there's a lot of different ways that you can view that. Just to answer this question, I'm going

to just take at face value as to what it says. Says, "Task orders under a BPA, can these be used individually for LET experience if they meet all of the other criteria, i.e., greater than 150k,"

Page 88

Page 86

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

and all that.

Well, are you talking -- actually, another question just popped in my mind as I read 3 that, so I'm going to hold off on that one. Sorry 4 about that. 5 Other industry GWACs and IDIQs allow 6 letter from independent CPAs on the validity of an offeror's cost accounting system. Will GSA allow 8 an independent assessor's certification in lieu of 9 DCAA, DCMA? I think I've answered that, and the 10 10 answer is no. 11 Can subcontractors be added after award? 12 12 13 Actually, the prime/sub CTAs is only for evaluation purposes. Once the contract is 14 14 awarded, you can sub to whoever you want to, and 15 15 whatever requirements take place on a task order. 16 16 If you had received an interim top 17 17 secret facility clearance prior to the proposal 18 submission, can you certify that you hold a top 19 19 secret facility clearance? 20 Well, if you -- I would -- just 21 remember, the RFP is what counts, so if I ever 2.2 Page 89 misspeak, it's not what I say up here. It's what 1 the RFP says. 2 My common sense tells me that if you 3 4 received an interim top secret clearance to work on a contract or a task order, and they've allowed 5 you to start working, if you can provide us 6 evidence of that interim top secret clearance, then you would get it. And if I'm wrong, I'm 8 wrong because the RFP governs. 9 The next one is are GSA rates considered 10 10 approved billing rates? 11 12 No. That's time and materials, and 13 labor hour type task orders, and we're talking about it in the context of cost reimbursement type 14 contracting. 15 Would GSA consider this team as 16 explained? Joint Venture A is bidding as a prime 17 small business, and teaming with Joint Venture B. 18 18 Company X --19 (Laughter) 20 MR. BYRD:: : -- Company X is part of 2.1 JV A, and JV B at the same time. Can we use our 22

JV to bid on A2SB?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

18

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

The answer to that would be, yes, if you meet all of the requirements that we ask for, and individual experience, and credentials, and such as that. Any small business can compete on Alliant2 Small Business.

Page: 23 (89 - 92)

Can the joint venture member participate to bid as a prime in unrestricted and prime as JV member? And the answer to that is, yes, they are two separate and distinct contracts as long as the, they're a small business on A2SB.

Can the JV member participate to bid in A2SB as a CTA, and prime as JV?

We're not restricting -- a contractor can submit a proposal. That contractor can also be a member of a joint venture that can submit a proposal. That contractor can also be a subcontractor on a prime and subcontractor team, and that CTA can submit a proposal.

We're not putting any restrictions on the contractors and as far as offerors, that they may or may not submit. You can submit as a prime,

Page 91

and you can be a member of a team too.

Okav. Per the FAR, can offeror's team with Alaskan Native Corporation or tribally-owned companies who do not certify as small under 541512?

The answer to this question is this. You can't team with somebody that's not a small business. ANC can propose on Alliant2 Small Business if the company is considered a small business under 541512.

> ANCs, that's nothing that will (inaudible). They're considered small, and the law considers them small, and the FAR considers them small, then they're a small business, and they can propose.

There are situations where I could envision a subsidiary or a company in a family of companies of ANCs that they would use meaningful commitment letters for subsidiaries, or divisions, or such as that. I thought somebody was coming up here to correct me. Then that would also be a Page 92

7/12/16 PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE possibility.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The only requirement they have to be a small business. So the answer to that question would be, no. They can't partner with an ANC that's not a small business as far as experience is concerned, as far as a CTA is concerned.

MR. COLE: Last question.

MR. BYRD:: : Okay, this is the last question. Does GSA recognize that the evaluation factors favor larger small businesses, small businesses that will likely size out before the contractor is awarded, and will be forced to off ramp after the base period? GWAC, best in the competition?

You know, that's actually a good question to end on. The Alliant2 Small Business is a total small business set aside. The requirements for it is that a company has to be a small business under NAICS Code 541412 at the time that they certified that they're a small business, or submit their proposal, and they are eligible to potentially win an award on Alliant2 Small

Page 93

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Business.

Okay. Alliant2 Small Business is probably the premier small business set aside for information technology and information technology services solutions. There's 80 awards made on it, so it's going to be highly competitive.

Just take that for what it is. Yes, you would expect that it would be very sophisticated small businesses that may be on the cusp of growing to be other than small that will win places on the contract. We expect that to happen. You'd be a fool if you didn't expect that to happen because just that the fierce competition that's going to take place.

We have another angle to it that's going to make it very interesting, and it may not help those companies that are on the cusp of being other than small businesses that are still considered small businesses.

When we add in the CTAs for the primes and team subcontractors, and JVs being able to form new JVs to hit those relevant experience

slots, frankly, I'm not, I don't know personally how it's going to turn out.

Page: 24 (93 - 96)

We will know when we open up the proposals and start sorting them out and see who the top 80 contractors are, and maybe it won't be the way that you would expect it to. I don't know how it's going to turn out, but we'll see that it is, it's a big IT services contract for the government, small business set aside that's highly competitive. So it is what it is.

MR. COLE: All right. Well, thanks, Greg, and thank you everybody for showing up, please.

(Applause)

MR. COLE: Please remember that even though Greg didn't get to your questions, make sure that you submit them to A2SB@gsa.gov. They will be recorded. They will be considered. And as Greg mentioned, we plan on posting not only the slides and the transcript, but there will be at least one question and response, you know, rounded up and posted on fedbizoops.

Page 95

So, hopefully, we will get to -- excuse me -- all the questions at that time.

But as for today, and as for this session, we do appreciate you being here. We know it's not easy getting around D.C. at this time. It's gonna be awful warm out there. Be careful, and good luck.

(Applause)

(Recess)

MR. COLE: All right. I think we'll go ahead and get started. I think if there's anymore people getting through security, we'll just work around that, and they could just come in and sit down and join us.

Welcome. Thank you for braving the heat, the Metro, and coming here right after lunch. So we'll try to keep things a little bit lively, but we if we see some heads going

(gesturing), we'll understand. We

may be doing that ourselves.

Anyway, we do appreciate everybody showing up. This is a pretty good turnout.

Page 96

2.2

2.1

There's some empty seats, which I was a surprised to see because we, as some people found out, filled up rather quickly, almost within an hour for two sessions. So that's a good thing.

And as a result of that, you probably saw on FedBizOpps that we decided to do a virtual one it as well to kind of make up for the folks that couldn't get here today.

When you all walked in, you were given index cards. This is the way that we're going to be accepting questions today, and we don't have mics in the crowd in the interest of time and making sure that we capture your questions and answer them correctly, we do want them on index cards. We'll have folks walk around picking them up. If you need an extra one, let somebody know. We'll get you an extra one.

But then we'll gather those at the end of the day, well, not the end of the day, we'll take a break after Greg goes through some of the things he'll be talking about, and we'll sort them out, and then we'll start to answer. And others

Page 97

no way possible we can get through them all, but we will do our best. We will be taking these back. All questions will be considered and looked at.

Also, we have the gentleman up front. We will be taking a transcription of this session. That will be made available on FedBizOpps a few days after this event. That'll be there. The slides will be there, but those won't do you much good without the actual narrative, so they'll both be posted on FedBizOpps when we get that taken care of, probably, like I said, a few days after this event.

I'll let you look at the agenda. This is what we're going to cover today. We'll probably go a little bit out of order with some of the speakers. Some folks get called away. You know, we're still, still working, so we don't get the day off to do this. We have to fit it in when we can.

 $\mbox{Let's see.} \quad \mbox{I want to make sure I cover}$ everything. We are only here for a couple of

hours, but if you gotta go, you gotta go. Out the back, to your right, to your right, and you'll find what you need.

By the way, just to introduce myself,
I'm Dean Cole. I'm a business management
specialist with the Small Business GWAC Division
at Kansas City.

Also here up on stage is our Director of Contract -- anyway, he's the GWAC contracts. And we've got the --

SPEAKER: Matt.

MR. COLE: Oh, Matt Verhulst. Sorry about that. This has been a heck of a day.

And over here we've got Greg Byrd. He's going to be giving you the meat-and-potatoes of this event, of the Alliant2 Small Business GWAC. He is the procuring contracting officer.

 $\mbox{Michael McFarland.} \ \ \mbox{He is the Director}$ of Acquisition Operations for ITS or --

MR. McFARLAND: ITS.

Page 99

MR. COLE: For ITS, which we are a part of, which is a part of FAS, which is part of GSA, and all that fun stuff, or FAS. We're not FTS anymore.

Anyway, without further ado, before I make too many more mistakes, I'm going to turn the mic over to Mike McFarland.

MR. McFARLAND: Thank you. Yes.

Everything that ITS does that is not Schedule 70 comes under me. So we have a lot going on.

I want to welcome you to the Alliant2
Small Business Pre-Proposal Conference. Alliant
Small Business is, and continues to be, one of
GSA's premier small business information
technology vehicles. We are proud that Alliant
Small Business suppliers are providing flexible
access to customize the IT solutions throughout
the government.

Alliant Small Business allows for long-term planning for large-scale program requirements due to its long contract links and multi-year options.

Page 100

2.2

Alliant Small Business solutions encompass all components of an integrated IT solution, including new technologies.

GSA's Small Business GWAC center currently operates three contracts with specialized socioeconomic designation, all of which we are in the process of re-competing, or going through an open season at once. We are very busy. Sorry for the leadership that led to that.

Each contract is designed to provide a streamlined method for agencies to utilize highly qualified small businesses to met their IT needs while achieving their agency socioeconomic contracting goals.

Premier among our small business GWAC is Alliant Small Business. The Alliant Small Business GWAC focuses on providing government contract opportunities to a wide range of highly qualified small businesses.

The small business contract provides flexible access to customize IT solutions from a diverse pool of nearly 50 industry partners with

Page 101

availability through 2024. Alliant Small Business allows for long-term planning of large-scale program requirements while strengthening opportunities for small businesses.

In FY 2015, Alliant Small Business received 90 task orders, and over \$2 billion in obligations, which is an increase of 8 percent in obligations from the previous fiscal year.

Alliant Small Business has been a remarkable success for agencies, for you our industry partners, and for GSA. Alliant Small Business has quickly become one of the most successful small business GWAC in the ITS portfolio.

For six-and-a-half years of Alliant Small Business, over 30 federal agencies have awarded nearly \$5 billion in task orders. Alliant Small Business has taught us the importance of partnerships, education, and training for both our agency customers, and our vendors, and customer service in developing and delivering successful contract vehicles.

The Navy has selected Alliant Small Business as mandatory use contracts for IT services, which is just one example of how the industries value the Alliant portfolio.

Page: 26 (101 - 104)

As a pre-competed vehicle, Alliant Small Business streamlines the acquisition process for many government agencies. Through this streamlining, agencies can save taxpayer money, and more quickly and efficiently procure their needed IT solutions.

Since I've come to GSA, one thing that has always impressed me about Alliant Small
Business is the amount of collaboration that goes on between all parties - GSA, our agency customers, and our industry partners.

Success on projects through Alliant

Small Business is a three-part partnership between

GSA, our customers, and the vendors. The GSA GWAC

Program uses three C's for success
communication, collaboration, and competition, and

we will continue this for Alliant 2 and Alliant 2

small business.

Page 103

The relationships we've built with our government and industry partners have been, and will continue to be critical to the program's success.

I want to thank you for everything all of you have done both to deliver and implement solutions under Alliant Small Business, and to help us develop our new vehicle.

And now the GSA GWAC Program, the leader in government wide acquisition contracts having established one of the very first federal GWACs, the answer contracts, in 1999, and creating more GWACs than any other federal agency, has developed the Alliant 2 and Alliant 2 Small Business GWAC solicitations, which were the sequel to the very prominent and successful Alliant Small Business GWACs.

ITS couldn't be more excited about the future of our GWAC program. Alliant 2 and Alliant 2 Small Business have been developed to continue to provide support to federal agencies that have mission critical and complex IT service

Page 102

industry partners.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

2.2

1

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

requirements, especially, for long-term programs. Alliant 2 and Alliant 2 Small Business' pre- solicitation phase has raised the bar of transparency and collaboration, collaborative processes involving both federal agencies, and

The Alliant 2 and Alliant 2 Small Business teams performed thorough market research. a laid significant groundwork in the preplanning phase with efforts including an interact group with more than seven thousand members, public review business case on all OMB MACs, meetings with the Coalition for Government Procurement, with AFCIA Northern Virginia Chapter, the Alliance for Public Action, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Office of Federal Procurement Policy, Small Business Administration, the U.S. Department of State, and ACT IAC, numerous presentations to interested agencies, a customer working group with 30 members from 11 agencies, an industry group working group with more than 500 participants, two RFIs that were issued through Page 105

FedBizOpps, two industry days with more than 500 attendees, face-to-face, one-on-one meetings between industry and Alliant 2 and Alliant 2 Small Business staff with 350 registrants.

The collective input and feedback toward the development of Alliant 2 and Alliant 2 Small Business this past year has been a major contribution to what we believe is an outstanding final product.

Notable overall enhancements between Alliant and Alliant Small Business, and Alliant 2 and Alliant 2 Small Business include skills improvements, standardized information technology service labor categories, new cyber security standards which are a particular focus for administrator, and for OMB, new environmental standards, increasing competition for orders which provides savings for the agencies, and more opportunities for our industry partners, and the incorporation of required DFAR supplement clauses and provisions into the master contract, so that now they automatically flow down to the task order

level on any and all task orders issued by DOD. 2 We recognize your contributions, and your providing insights to the challenges, I mean, 3

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

to the changes we've made since the first draft RFPs came out.

I'm confident that you will be pleased with the final product, and the role you each played in it. We at GSA cannot ever emphasize, overemphasize how the collaboration within GSA with our customer agencies, and with our industry partners, while doing market research, and in planning future solicitations and innovations is key to being sure that what we want to do is vetted, is on the right track, and considers all viewpoints.

The Alliant 2 and Alliant 2 Small Business collaborative process is the lodestar by which ITS is guiding development of our other contract offerings.

ITS is committed to keep our contracts, including Alliant 2 Small Business, maturing, growing, and evolving in the new marketplace.

Page 107

And now I'd like to turn you over to Casey Kelley, who is the Acting Director of the ITS GWAC.

Thank you all.

(Applause)

MR. KELLEY: Okay, I'm going to deviate. I had a script. I'm not going (off mic) because you're here to ask questions --

SPEAKER: You have to be next to it. MR. KELLEY: I completely forgot. I've got to stand here. That's okay.

So as you notice, we are having this transcribed. So we will, our team has indicated, I think as Dean said, we'll be collecting the transcriptions and going through that (inaudible) in some way, fashion, or form through FedBizOpps here in the very near future.

So welcome everybody. My name is Casey Kelly. I'm the Program Manager for Alliant 2 and Alliant 2 Small Business. I also am currently holding the head of the Director of the entire GSA GWAC Program.

Page 108

2.2

So I'm happy to see such a large crowd here. As you may be aware, this sold out within 24 yours. So fast that we had, we put together a virtual, the teams put together a virtual day on Monday.

And so what that represents, in my opinion, from the program side of the house, and what I want to be real, try and be real brief with is what you all know already. What is the likelihood of success that Alliant 2 and Alliant 2 Small Business will have. So the current Alliant and Alliant Small Business GWACs have done about \$34 billion to date for a little over seven years across 60 separate agencies of the network, and we're, as I often say, you're only as good as the people that you got.

And I, I'm a strong believer. We in our team, we have the best teams that exists. I'm biased. I know that. But that team includes our GSA personnel, and that team includes all of you in the room here, our industry partners. We take this very seriously. We've spent three years

Page 109

working on this acquisition plan.

You know, I used the term in this morning's session, there is a difference between the word, "create," and "construct." And so when you create something, you know, love, it may sound corny, love is at the forefront, because you're not waiting until that what that final product that you're working on, that you're designing or creating.

When you construct something, you're measuring the success of that kind of at the end what the final product is. Well, this team started three years ago, and started much longer than that as a program with prior GWACs because they're passionate about the work that they do. They love the work that they do. They love supporting, they love the mission of the work with the GSA GWAC, and that is, is how do we help other agencies perform and execute their missions by providing them quality contract vehicles to buy complex IT services faster, cheaper, and better. And that's what this is.

We think you are here at the right place, and we really are hoping that all of you are successful knowing you all can't be successful, but we're doing everything we can, have since Day 1, and you'll see here today as Greg gives his presentations, and he's going to open it up, gonna ask you to ask questions to continue to provide needed information to put forth the best type of acquisition, best type of proposal that we think best meets the needs of our customers that have complex IT service requirements that we take pleasure when they select us knowing they have choices to choose from.

Page: 28 (109 - 112)

So we welcome you. We wish you all the luck. We totally appreciate our leadership for supporting us, and I'm just proud to be a team member of this group here, and look forward to those of you who are successful working with you in the years ahead.

MR. COLE: Thank you.

(Applause)

Page 111

MR. BYRD:: : All right, thank you,

Casey. Let me get some things organized here. I

can tell you that I'm going to be speaking for

about 30 minutes. I'm going to go right to

Section L of the contract because I think that's

what you guys are interested in.

I'm going to spend all my time up here, the next minutes, talking about Section L and the format of the proposal, what we're looking for.

Before I do that though, I have a canned opening statement that I'm just simply going to read.

When I get through with that, then we'll delve into it.

Today in response to questions, I will be speaking extemporaneously about the A2SB RFP.

If there is a difference between what is said today, and the written language of the RFP, the written language of the RFP governs. Only an RFP amendment posted on FedBizOpps can change the RFP.

I am very pleased to be visiting with you today at this pre-proposal conference. As has been illustrated by previous speakers, GSA has

Page 112

2.2

been successfully and thoughtfully partnering with industry on GWACs and A2SB is leading the way into the future for federal information technology acquisition.

As the procuring contracting officer for A2SB, what I want to accomplish today is to share an overview of the RFP structure to reply to some of the questions asked to date that were sent to A2SB@gsa.gov, and to also reply to some of the questions that will be submitted on index cards today.

Regarding questions and responses, please recall that GSA reserves the right to publically discuss and publish, or simply consider questions and comments regarding the RFP.

That said, in the time available today, it is not possible to address every questions asked, but I will touch on some that has been asked frequently, or stand out. You can expect one or more rounds of questions and responses to be published on FBO, FedBizOpps, including those that were covered today.

Page 113

Please remember the A2SB procuring contracting officer is the sole point of contact for this procurement, and can be reached at A2SB@gsa.gov.

And I can tell you guys you got a more eloquent reading of this. This morning, I didn't have reading glasses and I struggled mightily.

(Laughter)

MR. BYRD:: : So I almost called on somebody to come up and read it for me, please.

So let's get started. I'm going to, how I'm going to answer questions as I go through my presentation is I'm just going to do it conversationally as I'm talking to you guy about the different sections of the RFP, questions that have been brought up that have been sent in.

I will just try to answer some of those as I go through these different sections. I'm going to go through all seven volumes of it, try to keep it under 30 minutes, 30 minutes or under so to give you guys time to get your questions up here, and so that we can answer the specific

questions that you guys have.

The Alliant 2 Small Business contract, of course, is multiple award, indefinitely delivery, indefinite quantity contract at MA IDIQ. It is a total small business set aside.

Page: 29 (113 - 116)

The NAICS code for the small business size standard is 541512, and the associated small business size standard is 27.5 million.

Now, that is the size, as we go through this, you know, I'm sure you guys saw the huge difference between the draft RFPs and the final RFPs, especially with CTAs whether it's the newly formed joint ventures, or primes with using a team of subcontractors, this is a question that has come up often in the questions that we received.

The 541512 size standard applies to everybody that's being proposed whether it's a subcontractor, whether it's a member of a joint venture, they have to meet that size standard.

They can't use some other NAICS code that may be uses and employee number, or something like that, to say that they were a small business, because as Page 115

you read the RFP, you know that all of those members have to be small businesses, and they have to be small under that NAICS code.

It is a base period of five years with one five- year option period, worldwide geographic scope, and it allows for all contract types - fixed price, time and materials, labor hour, cost reimbursement, and all the incentives that are tied to those contract types.

And we do have the option to hold an open season. One of the beauties of the way that we are conducting this, the point system and the award to the highest technically rated firm, reasonable price, the beauty to that is that it's not as cumbersome to do the evaluation so that if we lost a lot of contractors at the option period because of size, outgrowing of size standards.

It makes it easier for us to do on ramps, and to have that open season, and we would be more inclined to do that because, usually, we're not very inclined to do that.

Okay. As you can see, there is the Page 116

2.2

different volumes in Section L that we expect to be sent in. The one thing that I want to say is that all of it, all of these volumes are sent in by the prime contractor. They should all be on one CD. There's one exception to that that we'll get into a little bit later. Get it into it now.

The GSA Form 527, the financial information, we know that there's a little bit of sensitivity with contractors sharing that information with the prime contractor if they're on a team, or if there are a prime and sub relationship.

What we do allow under that situation is that we allow those to be in sealed envelopes within the proposal itself. We will not allow them to be sent in separately by those contractors. They will have to be sent to the offering prime contractor, whether JV or whatever. It has to be submitted with the proposal, and it can be within a sealed envelope within that proposal.

Okay. Talking about Volume 1. Just a Page 117

general, the general section. The first thing, the Standard Form 33, and I guess you guys you saw the ambiguity there where it had a due date on the SF 33 of 22nd of August at 4:00 p.m. Well, it's the 29th of August at 4:00 p.m., and that was in the RFP.

As soon as I saw that, I don't know if you saw it or not. You should go back in and look at it. But I did upload a new Standard Form 33 on there that had the correct date in it.

The document verification worksheet, it's a very important document because that's where your score is going to be. You may have noticed in the RFP that we requested, you're going to have the Excel version of that that's going to be on your CD, but we've also requested that you send in one paper copy of it with your proposal. The reason for that is it just, it's more efficient for us just to pull out that piece of paper without going into CDs at any, you know, at the very beginning just to find that.

What's very important is that make sure

that those line up with each other. Make sure it's the same on that's in the, that is in the Excel spreadsheet, and it's the same that's what's on that paper, because that's how we're going to line up the top 80 score getters is from that piece of paper that's in there on your self-scoring worksheet.

Page: 30 (117 - 120)

We've had a, I've had a few questions about the meaningful relationship commitment letters. What that basically is, is, all that is, is that we're allowing an offeror to use the resources within a corporate structure. It typically, it doesn't apply as much to small businesses. It's in both A2 and A2SB, but especially on some of the larger integrators, other contractors. It could apply because they may be using the resources or credential from a subsidiary or an affiliate, or, you know, those types of things. Something within their own corporate structure.

So that is what that means. There are other letters that we'll get into later about ${\tt Page \ 119}$

subcontractor commitments, and things like that if it's a prime/sub team.

I guess you did notice the huge difference between the draft RFPs and the new RFP, or the final RFP that's out on the streets, is that because of the NDAA 2016, we are allowing for newly-formed CTAs. That includes, it can be a prime with a subcontractor team. It can also be a joint venture and the members of that joint venture.

So what is going to be allowed is that whether it's a prime/subcontractor team, or whether it's a joint venture, well, those members of that team can individually use their relevant experience as projects for the prime contractor that's offering, or for the JV. So that's a huge difference.

As far as Volume 1 in general is, is that these are actually mentioned in, the same way that they're mentioned in the RFP, but for the partnership or joint venture, of course, it's a copy of the joint venture.

Page 120

2.2

Proposed subcontractor, oh, that's where you would be putting all of your subcontractor commitment letters in there.

The next thing I'd like to mention is the one other. It's the one -- I'm going to start off by saying this is another thing that has kind of confused a few people. There's a statement in the RFP about all of the work having to be performed as a prime contractor, if you read that carefully, I'm not saying that you can't have prime subcontractor teams, or anything like that. What I'm saying is that if you're using a subcontractor's relevant experience project to satisfy one of the PSCs, or the LETs relevant experience projects, that subcontractor had to perform that as a prime contractor. They can't perform it as a subcontractor. There had to be a prime contractor on that work. So that's what it means when we actually say that all work has to be performed as a prime contractor.

 $\label{eq:theorem} \mbox{There is actually one exception to that.}$ We have a, it's claiming prime contractor relevant

Page 121

experience from an existing or previous joint venture or partnership.

We are allowing a prime contractor, and this was in the drafts also. We're allowing a prime contractor to use experience that they performed on a joint venture. The only time they can do that is if they were the only member of the joint venture that performed that, and it's verified by all the members of that joint venture signing off on it saying, yes, this was the company, the only company that performed under this, under this particular project. So the prime can use that. That's a the only instance where you don't have to be a prime contractor.

And then the other, the Professional Employee Compensation Plan, Uncompensated Overtime Policy, they just, they're just typical. I haven't had very many questions about them.

As far as the reps and certs, the representation and certifications, if the RFP clearly states that if you're doing a prime subcontractor team, or if you're doing a JV that

we expect to have those representations and certifications for every single subcontractor, and for every single member of the joint venture.

Page: 31 (121 - 124)

Okay. Getting into Volume 2, relevant experience. Okay. I've got a number of questions about confusing NAICS codes with PSC codes. What rules, the NAICS codes has nothing to do with the relevant experience projects in the PSC. Nothing to do with it. It's all about PSC codes.

The verification for the, especially for the PSC, can be very simple. All of the information can be gleaned from a FPDS-NG report. Everything that we're asking for. If the project is totally verified by the FPDS report that you're required to send to us, that's basically all we need. We do ask for a copy of the statement of work. We ask for you to fill out the PSC experience template. I forgot what JP number it was, but we do, we ask for the template. We ask for the statement of work, but if everything's verified from FPDS, that's all we want is the FPDS report because projects can be verified totally

from that, for everything that we're asking for.

Now, if the FPDS-NG is unavailable, or it's incomplete, or inaccurate, there is another way, another verification process, and it's a little bit more detailed.

This is when the PSC template has to be signed off on by a contracting officer, a warranted contracting officer that verifies that this information is correct, and that PSC was a part of this project.

Another thing to say about the PSC, this also applies to the LET. The PSC, and the work under that PSC had to have been integral to that project, to that work.

We tell you guys in the RFP to just use your reasonable discretion as to whether or not you think that you did that type of PSC work in that relevant experience project that you're using. And we'll use our reasonable discretion to see if we agree with you.

The PSC, we're not asking for you to ask a contracting officer to go in and change a FPDS ${\tt Page} \ \ 124$

2.2

report to put a different PSC code in there. We do not want you to do that. We're not asking for that.

It could very well be multiple PSCs could have been involved in work on a specific project. We just want you to verify that that piece was part of that project by highlighting inside, we ask you to highlight within the statement of work, and we ask you to get a signature from a warranted contracting officer that, yes, this is correct. What they're representing is correct.

Now, the contracting officer is the default. That's who we're asking for. There is, if a contracting officer is not available, we are allowing for a contracting officer's representative to sign off, to sign off on. If a contracting officer's representative signs off on, is going to sign off that, yes, this PSC was involved in this work, integral to this work, we also ask that you also give us a proof through some kind of documentation that an email was sent

to the contracting officer by the COR making the contracting officer aware that they are representing this.

And there are a lot of instances, I total understand when COs are not available or gone, they're retired. CORs are gone. You know, I understand that. But what you should do, it doesn't alleviate the requirement for CO signatures or COR signatures. What you can do, there is an acquisition office that was responsible for that work, and, you know, and, say, if -- you may find other ways, other people to be signing off on it, but it has to be the acquisition office that actually awarded that work.

Okay. As you saw in the RFP, PSCs can only be used one time. So for a total, you have a total of seven instances were you can give us a PSC relevant experience project. It's four in Group 1, two in Group 2, and one in Group 3. So it's a total of seven projects. They all have to be separate projects. You can't use a PSC for the

same project.

Page 125

They have to be ongoing or completed within the last five years. There has to be one year of performance on it. There are three exceptions to that one year performance.

Page: 32 (125 - 128)

One of them is that there's a final or interim PPIRs or CPARs. One of them is that there's a completed award fee determination. And if the period of performance is less than one year, but it is completed, that is also, that's also, that's the only other time that it can be less than a year. And, of course, it has to meet all the dollar thresholds, and for PSCs I believe it's at \$1 million.

Okay. For the extra points that you receive on the PSCs, the first one is the experience project size and complexity. From the RFP, it's like two, up to five million. You get so many points. If you have projects from five to 15 million, you get so many points. Projects greater than 15 million, you get so many points.

I mean, just as a sidenote, the average

Page 127

task orders on the Alliant Small Business GWAC, it averages like about \$14 million to \$16 million.

So we do have some very substantial work on Alliant Small Business. We expect it to be on Alliant 2 Small business too.

Now, the next three, the demonstrating experience with multiple federal government customers, the project with cost reimbursement, and the fair opportunity task order award against a MA IDIQ contract, the alternative verification does not apply to those. It has to be on the FPDS report. The only verification that we'll accept is on FTDS-NG.

If there's not a FPDS-NG report, all I can say is that's just too bad, because those have to be verified by FPDS-NG reports.

What you'll, the demonstrating experience with multiple federal government customers, that was a change from our draft RFPs, the way that we're doing it now. Now, it's being, now you get that, you get that with the funding agency ID.

Page 128

2.2

It used to be that list of agencies that if you had the multiple across that list, then you got the points. We listened to you when you talked about funding agency IDs. We thought that that was reasonable because we got a lot of input from contractors about that. So we changed that federal agency funding ID. So you will get those extra points as the RFP explains if you have that experience across multiple federal government customers.

Also, the project with cost reimbursement. One of the, the primary reason that we're using FPDS-NG is that verification, because that contracting officer put that in there as a cost reimbursement contract, or a cost reimbursement task order.

We're not interested in task orders that had a piece of cost reimbursement. That's not the primary reason for it. We want these, we want the extra credit to go to the contract, to those contractors that actually submit proposals that were, the preponderance of it was cost

Page 129

2.2

reimbursement contracting to the point where the contracting officer said the type of contract was a cost reimbursement contract.

Cost reimbursement is important to us. As you'll see also when we had the cost accounting system's information that I'll go into later, it's important to us because it's important to our customers. We want a cadre of contractors to win under this contract that have cost reimbursement experience. We want the preponderance of them to have cost reimbursement contracting experience because that's one of the primary reasons, especially DOD (inaudible) uses our contract. It's what our customers want. It's one of the reasons that Alliant Small Business was a wildly successful contract was because of the, being, having the ability to award cost reimbursement task orders. A third of them, or more, of our task orders under Alliant Small Business was cost reimbursement. So that's, that's verified with FPDS-NG.

The last one that's verified with

Page 130

FPDS-NG is the fair opportunity task order award against a MA IDIQ contract. To answer a question that I know is going to be asked, it's been asked already on our templates, and I thank you guys for using the template. I've only had a handful that didn't use the question template, so that was, that was great that you're using it.

Page: 33 (129 - 132)

Lot of questions about does a competition on GSA schedules count as an award against a MA IDIQ contract. The answer to that question is, no. What we're talking about is FAR Part 16, 16.5, multiple award, indefinite delivery, and -- multiple award contracts, but specifically multiple award, indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity contracts where fair opportunity was provided for. Fair opportunity and FAR 16.505.

So FAR Part 8 does not apply to this, and it's not awards against GSA schedules. The reason for this, the reason that contractors are getting extra points for this is because this is what this contract is, is a multiple award IDIQ

Page 131

contract, a GWAC.

We're giving extra points for contractors that have experience managing those types of contracts, and managing GWACs. It's a different animal than a GSA federal supply schedule contract. So that's why it's limited to MA IDIQ contracts, and not simply schedules.

And the project -- how am I doing on time. I may be going a little slow here. I don't want to cut into you guys' questions.

Project in a foreign location. The way that we define a foreign location is outside the United States, and the way that we define the United States and the RFP is that it's the 48 contiguous states, it is Alaska, and it's Hawaii. And it's all the U.S. possessions and territories.

So if it's in that, we consider it the United States. If it's outside of that, then they can be considered as at a foreign location.

As the RFP says, we're not, you won't get credit for TDY. You won't get credit for just traveling to foreign locations that are just, you

Page 132

2.2

know, quick trips and such as that. We're actually looking for people that actually have feet on the ground, and working in a foreign location under a task order, or a contract.

This we're not limiting it to FPDS-NG, although it can be verified on FPDS-NG because we understand that there are, sometimes there are contracts and task orders that may be coded as taking place in the United States, but there's a, you know, a very, a significant contingent that's being performed overseas, and we'll accept that as long as the contracting officer agrees that, yes, there is work being performed on in a foreign location.

And I would say this. I would say that you, just as I was talking about PSCs and, well, I will be talking about LETs, but just as I was talking about experience in using your reasonable judgment and discretion about whether that PSC fits, I would also tell you to use your reasonable discretion about whether or not you think that this is work being performed in a foreign

Page 133

location, understanding that you can't use the TDYs and the short trips and stuff like that.

So if you use your reasonable discretion, we, in part, will use our reasonable discretion to see if we agree with what you're telling us. If our reasonable discretion tells us that, yeah, we'll say that's in a foreign location, then you get the points. If not, then you won't get the points, but, you know, you just use your discretion. If you think work is being performed in a foreign location, give yourself the benefit of the doubt, and if we disagree with you, we'll remove the points.

Okay. The leading edge technology.

That's the other relevant experience part of this RFP. Just as the PSCs, a project can be used only one time in LETs. It can't be used another, more than once.

You do get an advantage though because the cross-pollination between PSCs and LETs. You can actually use a PSC project one time in the LETs. So what that gives you, it gives you the

opportunity up to seven instances where you can use a PSC project in your LETs, if that LET is in one of those PSC projects.

So you do get, you get, you do get that advantage that you can use a PSC once in your LETs, up to seven.

Now, the verification of the LETs little bit different than the PSCs because it's not an FPDS issue. That verification is going to be (inaudible) if FPDS incorrect or

not complete. We expect, you know, we'll expect the

Page: 34 (133 - 136)

LET project templates to be filled out. We expect the statements of work with, highlighted in yellow as we asked showing those parts, you know, that satisfy that LET. We also expect the award form, and the sign off from the CO, or the COR just as I was talking about in the PSCs to verify that.

The leading edge technologies we've got them defined for the RFP on the J.P-4. We have one LET's that you get, if you notice, you get ${\tt Page \ 135}$

graduated points. There's three LETs within each one of the ten LET categories for a total of 30.

You could ultimately have a total of 30 LET citations.

You can see the graduated points that you get a 100, 200, 300 for each of those, for each one of those, and it's cumulative so you get a total of 600 points for each LET if you've got all three marks on them.

And the other things, the other, the only bonus points for the LET is the breadth across LETs. You wouldn't get breadth for three LETs within a single LET, but the more leading edge technologies that you can hit, the more bonus points that you can get.

And that's another one of the -- I would say, this. Please don't take up time sending me questions about typos, or when you do your index card, because I'm, after all the questions you guys have sent in, I'm fully aware of all the typos that are in there the RFP, and I have already fixed the JP-2 documentation verification

Page 136

2.2

so that those will add up correctly. When somebody brought up that question, I went in and pulled it from, direct from FPDS-NG, and typed in, yes, into each one of those, and for the first one, the 500 didn't, 500 points didn't come up.

So I've already fixed that. There will be an amendment that we'll be fixing all of the typos and everything. It'll be forthcoming. It probably won't be that long that amendment will come out that we'll have all those fixed.

So you probably want to ask more substantive questions than just to let me know that there was a typo somewhere, because I'm fully aware of all of them.

Okay. We'll go directly into past performance. Okay. The only information that we're asking, the only past performance projects that are supposed to be submitted in accordance with the RFP is from the PSC. So we will have, and we require a past performance on each one of the PSC relative experience citations that you used. So it will be a total of up to seven past

Page 137

performance if you use, if you do all seven PSC codes.

Actually, I was a little amiss for not mentioning this in the morning session, but it will be recorded, and that's for sure. So I guess when you go back, listen to both, if you want to listen to these transcripts, listen to both sessions because you might get something more out of one than the other and vice versa.

I had a lot of comments about the past performance not adding up correctly. I went back to the sheet, and I figured out what was going on. They are adding up correctly. I may, in an amendment, I may put a bold block around where you're supposed to put this in.

We do say that all you're supposed to put in is, yes, down the line, but there's one instance where you put a number instead of yes.

And we're asking you how many projects are you submitting in past performance. For instance, if you had all seven PSCs, there's a little block that you put seven in. Once you put that seven

in, it populates down the side of how many points you get for each one of the PSCs. If you only had three, then it'll populate a different number that goes down the side.

Page: 35 (137 - 140)

So it is working. You just have to remember to put the number of projects in that square. And I'll try to make it more apparent in an amendment because I've got to fix that form anyways, and I'll make it, highlight or bold it or something like that so that everybody's aware that you should put that number in there.

Okay. As far as past performance is concerned, if there a PPIRSs, and what we're asking for is the most current PPIRS's past performance report, if that's, if you have that all we want and that's all we need for past performance.

If for some reason, that PPIRS doesn't exist, you know, every federal agency is, unless it's classified information, you know, classified task order, but for the most part, every agency is required to put that past performance information

Page 139

into CPARs, which flows into PPIRSs.

But if for some reason, it's not in there, we've provided you a past performance template. That template is, dovetails exactly with what we see in PPIRSs and what those rating elements are.

So what we require is that you send that to your customer and that customer has to fill out that past performance template. That past performance template, the customer can send it back to you. They have to send it back to you.

And it has to be part of your package.

So just make sure when you send that past performance out, hopefully, you've got
PPIRSs. That's the easy way. But if you don't,
then make sure that they send that template back
to you, and it's part of your package. Everything
has to be part of your package. We won't take
anything outside of your proposal that you send to
us. So if we get a FedEx with a past performance
in it, oh, well.

If you do have a negative past

Page 140

2.2

performance, we do provide you the opportunity to write a one-page narrative explaining that negative past performance which can help you significantly, you tremendously if there is negative past performance because it may negate every, you know, at the very least may cause you to get a neutral.

But we do, we do ask for that one-page narrative. I know that in the table it says double-sided, which is I've got tons of questions. what do you mean by double-sided if it's one page?

That's another amendment that's going to change. It is just one page, and it's hard to double side one page.

Okay. System certifications and clearances. Probably, the most important thing that I need to say about this section is that, okay, if you're a prime contractor just proposing, no team of subs, of course, all of these credentials have to be in your name. If you're a joint venture with a team of joint venture members, one of two things, either the joint

Page 141

venture has the credential itself, or every single member of that joint venture has that credential up to the levels that you're getting, that you're claiming those points.

The other thing, that's the same for a prime and a team of subcontractors. The prime contractor --

SPEAKER: (Off mic.)

 $\label{eq:mr.byrd} \mbox{MR. BYRD::} : \mbox{That's right. I'm glad I}$ caught myself there.

If it's a prime and a team of subcontractors, it's just the prime contractor that has to have those certifications.

I know when I'm going astray.

(Laugher)

MR. BYRD:: : You know, frankly, the primary purpose of that is that these credentials lose their utility. If it's just a hodgepodge of different credentials from different subcontractors, it doesn't mean anything. It doesn't mean anything on the task orders that are awarded under the contract unless that particular Page 142

subcontractor is doing all the work. We're looking for utility under these credentials.

The cost accounting system and audit information, that's a major change from the original Alliant Small Business. I don't know if any of you guys were involved in that, but on the original small business, that was a go-no go factor. You either, you had it just as we had it written now. You either had it or you didn't have it. You couldn't even play if you didn't have accounting systems that had been audited and determined adequate for cost reimbursement contracting?

So this is a huge change. This is just simply another scoring element. So it does, you're not prevented from submitting an offer because you don't have that, because potentially you may be able to make it up in different areas and get points in different areas, and maybe make it up and get into the top 80.

 $\label{eq:But it is, it's important to us for the} \\$ same reason that I was mentioning earlier about

Page 143

the cost reimbursement contracting, and the popularity of it under our contracts and our customers and what they want. The other thing is that GSA is not going to sponsor any cost reimbursement audits either.

The rest of them, you know, when we're talking about -- I'll already tell you now that I already know that approved purchasing systems, we may not get one small business that has an approved purchasing system, but it worked.

When we were talking about the Alliant 2 and the Alliant 2 Small Business, we were using, we're trying to keep them as close as possible to each other. There are small businesses that have approved purchasing systems, and if you have it, that's great, and then you would get the points.

But I think that on the original Alliant Small Business, it was an evaluation factor, but we only had one, maybe two contractors that actually had it. But it is part of the scoring system. All of these, the approved purchasing system, forward pricing rate agreements, earned Page 144

2.2

value management system, acceptable estimating systems, those are all, it's clear the documentation what we're looking for is in the RFP. It's clear to us. At least we think it is.

You know, it's simply just the report that says that, you know, the document, the letter, whatever it is that just says that you have that credential, and that you have forward pricing rate agreements, and they've been approved, and such as that. So that's the document that we're looking for.

The ISOs and CMMIs, that's pretty straightforward: You either, you have it, and you have the certificate, or you don't. So that's pretty straightforward too.

Okay. The organizational risk assessment. There's a few things I want to mention about this. It is -- want to make clear about what our definitions are of some of these things.

 $\label{prop:linear} \mbox{ It is, I would imagine that in an }$ amendment, or I know in an amendment that we're

Page 145

If they previously performed, and they, as a prime and subcontractor relationship, then you can get the points if you've done it with each one of your subcontract members.

Now, it can't go in reverse. The prime contractor that's proposing under the Alliant 2 Small Business, they had to have been the prime contractor in this prime/sub relationship. The other company couldn't have been a prime and subbed to the prime that's submitting on A2SB. The prime contractor had to have been the prime contractor with that relationship.

Here's what we mean by previously performed. For the purposes of this evaluation factor, previously performed is defined as performance that took place before the issuance of the A2SB solicitation. The exact words are not in the RFP right now, but by amendment, they will be in the RFP later.

There's also, there's two words that are critical there. The one is that just defined which was "previously". The other one is

Page 147

going to make it more clear.

A business arrangement. You get the points if you previously performed as this business arrangement. A business arrangement to us is an individual company, that's a slam dunk. There's nothing else to do. You just give yourself the points because you're just an individual company and you had performed as yourself.

A joint venture, a joint venture and its members. If a joint venture has previously performed as that same joint venture before the release of the RFP, then they would be able to get those points.

The way that we've defined it with a prime contractor and his proposed first tier subcontractor team, a prime contractor has to have subcontracted to each one of the members of the, each one of the subcontractors that they're using previously, and to use, and I'm going to explain what previously performed means here in just a second.

"performed". We're not looking for contract, we're not looking for just agreements or just subcontracts that have been (inaudible) and there's been no performance on any work whatsoever.

What we're looking for is performance. If you have a sub, if you as a prime contractor offering with a team of subcontractors, and you are, all of your subcontractors you have had, they have subcontracted to you in the past, it had to have been work that was actually performed. Work. Not just an agreement. We all know what work means. They're actually doing work under the contract or under the task order.

So that's what previously performed means, and we will tighten that up in an amendment.

Okay. I'm almost -- how am I doing on time?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ COLE: You should finish this part, and then we'll do the questions.

MR. BYRD:: : Yeah. I'm going to run

Page 148

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

1

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

7/12/16 PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE Page: 38 (149 - 152) through this part. I'm just going to make sure that there's not something specifically that I 2 need to tell you about it, but it's the cost 3 price. GSA scheduled pricing, I've had dozens of 4 to be fair and reasonable. questions about this. GSA scheduled pricing has 5 nothing to do with this cost and price. This is 6 for this multiple award IDIQ contract. 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

We've given you the ranges that we consider to be fair and reasonable for direct labor. It's just direct labor only. What the employee is being paid. No fringe benefits, nothing like that. Just the direct labor.

We've told you what we thought is reasonable and in a range. You go outside of that range, either over or under at your own peril. If you do it, if you do outside of that range --

SPEAKER: Can't hear you.

MR. BYRD:: : Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. What I was saying is that we've provided those ranges for direct labor, and it's direct labor only. It doesn't include any fringe benefits, no G&A, no overhead, just what the

Page 149

employee is being paid.

What I was saying earlier is that we've determined that range to be fair and reasonable on its face. We don't limit you. You can outside of that range. This applies to the profit that we've always put at 7.5 percent. That profit of 7.5 percent, remember these labor rates only apply to time and materials, and labor hour type task orders, which is minimal risk for a contractor.

And you go outside of those ranges, what I was saying is that you do that at your own peril. We've determined those ranges to be fair and reasonable. If you do go outside those ranges, if you go above or below the range that we put, we expect to see an explanation as to why you did that.

Same thing applies to overhead. If you do things that are not in accordance with your approved (inaudible), approved accounting systems, whatever, if you do things outside of that, you'd have to explain that also. We also require you to explain any profit that's above the 7.5 percent.

20 21

So without dictating what you, the price that you propose, we're just telling you that we've already set these ranges which we determined

The other thing that I want to make mention is that you're only going to be putting those direct labor rates and overhead in year one, because the spreadsheet's going to auto populate. We do allow you can create more columns under your direct, I'm sorry, under your indirect for your G&A and overhead, just to accommodate different companies in different ways, that they established their overhead so you -- the only thing that you can alter in that is to create new columns, and to put in, you can create the columns, you may not need to create any, but you put in your direct labor rate, you put in your overhead rates, it'll automatically auto populate all ten years.

We have an escalation built in of 1.93 percent. It does say 1.8 something percent in the RFP, but that's another one of those artifacts that needs to be taken care of from all the drafts

Page 151

that we've done because we did an upgrade to the escalation.

We do, also do -- and we'll fix that in an amendment. We also do allow at the option period, we're going to relook at that, that escalations, and we'll take the three previous years, so we will do an economic adjustment at the option period if it has substantially gone up or down.

So it will populate it for all ten years. It's a possibility that there'll be a reestablishment at the option period for the escalation that's build into the contract.

Let me make sure there's nothing in here important I need to you guys.

(Pause)

MR. BYRD:: : Here's a government site and a contractor site spreadsheet.

Okay. On the final one, this will be a quickie. The final one, I think I've already said most of what I need to say about the responsibility. Under the Volume 7,

Page 152

if you'd like, and I'll gather them as well.

(Recess)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. COLE: This has to be part of the official record. But we will address as many of them as can today. And, also, please even though you submitted a question here, I think I brought this up earlier, please submit them in writing again via email to A2SB@gsa.gov. That way it's --I know you've had to scribble the questions down pretty fast, and Greg will give you more time to, if you word the question a little more detailed, and give us time to answer it in more detail, but all questions will be considered.

And we will be also posting --again, the transcript will be posted at FedBizOpps. The slides will be posted to FedBizOpps.

We will be doing some questions and responses that will also be posted up there in the Page 154 days to come.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

So I'll turn it over to you. Are you ready?

Page: 39 (153 - 156)

MR. BYRD:: : All right, as Dean said, we definitely won't be able to get through all these questions. But for the remaining time that we have, I'll go through as many as we can, the ones that I will answer.

(Laughter)

MR. BYRD:: : We do get some very good questions. Some of them may be very nuanced that we actually need to speak among ourselves, you know, to determine how we want to answer those questions. Those questions will probably, probably, they will be answered more formally in questions and answers that will be posted to FedBizOpps, but I'll get through as many of these as I can today.

Okay. First question. Under 5.1.5.2, the subcontractors need to have a previous relationship with the prime contractor to submit. 5.1.5.2 is the proposed subcontractor's CTA, prime Page 155

Page 156

with subcontractors.

They actually ask two questions. I'll answer them. The simple answer to that questions is, no, they don't.

Here's the second part of that question. If they don't, and can be submitted, then prime loses points in 5.5.1.

That's incorrect. They don't lose any points. They just are not able to gain additional bonus points that are in the RFP.

We're not going to take points away from anybody. If they can't do the contract, they can't gain the points in the contract and the risk assessment, if they can't gain the, it's just points that are available as a bonus for that risk, under that risk assessment. We're not taking points away from anybody.

Let's go to the second one. Okay. This is line with the same one, and I just want to correct words that are being used in the question.

Are we correct in understanding that there is a 7,500 point penalty if a company

2.2

partners with another vendor with whom they had not worked with previously. No. There will not be a 7,500 point penalty. We're not going to take seven thousand five hundred points away from somebody because they don't, they don't gain the contract, the contractor risk assessment.

This is a, it's important. I mean, this is an important issue as far as the contractor risk assessment. It's important to us. We want highly performing contractors. There can be, not necessarily has to be, but there can be backed up with a lot of research, high risk involved in newly-formed ventures and joint ventures, prime/subcontractor relationships. Those risks that we may not even be aware of.

And so that's why if companies had previously performed together, whether it's a JV has previously performed, an individual contractor, an individual company itself proposing, or if it's a prime and subcontractors that they can show that they have subcontracted on past performance, on previous performance to each

We've also said that we were making 80 awards. You'll notice the comment in the RFP that even if there's a single point difference between Offeror No. 80 and Offeror No. 81. 81's not getting an award, and 80 is getting an award. The only caveat to that is if there's a tie only at the 80 position. If there's a tie at the 80th position, then both of those offerors or multiple offerors, would get awards.

If there's a tie at the 39th position, one of those offerors takes the 39th position, the other offeror takes the 40th position. The only time a tie increases the number of awards is at the 80th position. Got that out.

And, no, there are not minimum points.

We didn't establish minimum points as a go-no go
factor. This is new to use also. We would
probably be able to, you would market research,
you'd be able to answer that question on the
Alliant 3 Small Business because we would have had
the history of this.

(Laughter).

Page 159

Page 157

2.1

one of their subcontractors, then they will gain the 7,500 points for the risk assessment.

And it's important to us. We want contractors that can perform under our contracts. But it's not a penalty. It's just like any other additional bonus points that's throughout the solicitation or the RFP that you can gain if you actually have that.

This is also a very frequent question that I get. Given your extensive market research for A2SB in order to save SBEs, time and money can you share with the minimal PSC code point value, and the minimal LET code point value should be before considering the bid on A2SB?

We don't have any minimal points. It's just the top 80, and if there's a ties at 80.

Actually, <inaudible., I'm actually going to step away from my questions for just a moment, so I can state one thing.

As in Section M, what we said, we are making, it's awards that being made to the highest technically rated, fair and reasonable price.

MR. BYRD:: : Frankly, we don't know.

I do not know where the points are going to fall
out for the top 80 under there. There's a lot of
people out there saying that they can figure out
what that number will be, but good luck to that.

We'll see it when we get the proposals, and the top 80 proposals we'll have a much better idea of what that minimum amount to actually get an award. But we don't have a minimum, and it's just a business decision that each one of you guys are gonna have to make when you line everything up.

Please clarify if you can only use a PSC code once amongst the seven allowed, or just once within each of the three groups.

You can only use it once across all seven. It's not once in a group. So the ultimate number that you, number of PSC relevant experience citations that you can give us is seven. That's the most that you can give us.

Four from one, two from two, and one from three. For offeror using work performed Page 160

2.2

under a JV, please confirm that a majority of JV members must certify that the offeror performed all the work.

Okay. I'm going to preface this and the question that I think is being answered, and being asked, this is where, if the question has to do with a prime contractor that's using experience, either a PSC or a LET, where they performed under a joint venture, and they were the only member of that joint venture that performed that work, and they're using it as their own, the only instance that you can use work where you weren't the prime contractor, a majority of the JV members has to sign off on that template verifying that you did all of the work, and that means every bit of the work. And that means the work work. That doesn't mean the task order management from a managing venture or something like that. We're talking about the work that's actually being performed.

If you have open seasons where you just bring on the companies who finished in 81st position, 82nd, et cetera, of original

Page 161

2.2

2.1

solicitation, or will new responses be solicited (inaudible) required? You know,

I'm going to answer that by

saying that it's clear in the RFP how we're going to be doing open season. I would suggest that you read the RFP about the open season.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{Do}}$ awardees have to recertify as small businesses, 541512, at the period of performance start?

The answer to that is, no, because small business self-certification actually take place when the offeror certifies that, and that's usually when they submit a proposal. There's not going to be a recertification when we get ready to award, it's a one-time certification when an offeror certifies at the time they certify that they're a small business on the proposal. Then we rely on that.

So that's the, I'm going to extrapolate that into some other answers to some potential questions from that same topic.

Page 162

There are two instances where you do have to rerepresent your size status on the GWAC on the Alliant 2 Small Business. One of them would be acquisitions and mergers. I can tell you now the terms and conditions of the contract if due to an acquisition or merger, a contractor no longer is a small business, and is now a other than small business, they are removed from the contract.

Page: 41 (161 - 164)

When I say remove from the contract, they're allowed, task orders are allowed to continue and such, but they are removed from the contract.

The other time that you rerepresent your size status is after the fifth year of the contract. So that actually coincides with our option period. The base period is five years long. That rerepresentation when it takes place, the contractors that rerepresent themselves to be other than small, they actually, the contracts are not actually terminated. They actually stay on the contract, but they're re-coded as other than Page 163

small businesses, and the terms of the contract prevents them from completing for new work under the contract.

The only reason that the contract, that they maintain the contract is that we want to give our customers the ability with a limited number of exceptions to fair opportunity. I think we actually spell out three of them, but the primary one is the follow-on to a previously competed contract. We don't want our customers to be able to lose that ability to do that, because that's just written into the laws and written into the regulations, and we want our customers to be able to do that if they want to do that. But they won't be able to in the option period compete for new work because they're set aside in their own holding pen.

So that's the two times that we rerepresent. We wouldn't be rerepresenting before we're making an award.

 $\label{eq:scaling} \mbox{If a PSC group, relevant experience, is} \\ \mbox{with a commercial customer, can it get the} \\ \mbox{Page } 164$

2.2

Multiple federal government customer bonus?

Yeah, that's a good, this is a good time to mention it. Commercial work does count. Of course, there's not going to be an FPDS-NG, so you would go through the process of verification that we list. If a FPDS is not available, the signatures that take place in that instance for commercial work would be a corporate official, corporate officer that would sign off and say, yes, this type of work was performed.

As far as answering the question, the answer to the question is no. It's only federal government customers that you can actually get that bonus points. And if you remember, it was one of the three where I said that the FPDS-NG is the only verification document for a multiple, yeah, for the multiple federal government customers.

So, no. If it's commercial work, you would not be able to, it would not be a federal customer.

How are PSCs grouped? That is, where

Page 165

2.1

did Group 1, 2, 3 originate?

Actually, Richard Blake (inaudible).

SPEAKER: (Off mic)

MR. BYRD:: : Oh, I'm not going to ask him to say anything. I'm just mentioning names.

The technical -- Paul Bowen, the technical side of our house, they did a lot of extensive research on the PSCs, the PSCs that are used in Alliant 2 Small Business.

Basically, what it boils down to,
they're selected to represent the offering GSA
wants to bring to the market. It's those PSCs
that are most important to us because it's the
PSCs most used by our customers in that work. And
then that's how that came about.

I was giving Richard a (inaudible) shout out. No, there's a lot of research done on those PSCs.

The next question is a good question. I don't have an answer yet. I don't have a silver bullet answer for it. My answer to it is do the best that you can. But we're not going to change

the requirements that we've had for validation, but it is a great question. And believe me, we've thought about it a lot. So here we go.

It's a long question. I can paraphrase the question by basically saying what if we cannot provide proof of clear tasks, top secret type of stuff?

It's not in FPDS. Top secret work, classified work, they're not required to put in an FPDS. They may be reluctant to give any information about the task order. All I can tell you is we're not relaxing any of the requirements. Like I said earlier, I don't have a silver bullet. All I can say is just do your best. We still require the verification that we require in the RFP.

 $\label{eq:continuous} \mbox{Are we running out of time?} \quad \mbox{More} \\ \mbox{questions.}$

MR. COLE: I've got more.

MR. BYRD:: : Okay. DCAA accounting system is a significant points associated. It is not something that an offeror controls. Can the $\hbox{Page 167}$

government consider third party certification for compliance on acceptable requirement just like CIOSP 3, et cetera.

The answer to that, we have specific reasons why we ask for the cost reimbursement contracting credentials both in experience and cost accounting systems.

The answer to the question is, no. You have to have had an accounting system that has been audited and determined adequate by a cognizant federal agency, typically, DCAA, that your accounting systems are adequate for cost reimbursement contracting.

They're generally tied to a cost reimbursement type of a task order, or a contract. Not generally. They are tied to a cost reimbursement type of a task order, or a contract.

As I said earlier, there's reasons that we do this because we want, we have customers that we have to satisfy.

Cost reimbursement is wildly popular under Alliant Small Business, and it will be ${\tt Page} \ \ 168$

2.2

wildly popular under Alliant 2 Small business. We want contracting officers that are prepared on Day 1 when the contract is awarded to be able to do cost reimbursement type work. Audited accounting systems, a lot of our customers do go-no goes from Day 1 for cost reimbursement, that they have a go-no go for those accounting system.

We have to have adequate competition for task orders, and that doesn't mean that some contractors won't get an award because they may make up points somewhere else where they don't have that accounting system, the audited accounting system. And they would be able to, there may be an agency that will sponsor an audit that awards a task order, and they may be able to get that accounting system audited.

For us at this point in this
competition, we're very firm on it. It was
actually a go-no go on Alliant Small Business.
We've relaxed that significantly. It's not a go,
no go. It's just one extra bonus points among
many extra points that you can get under the

Page 169

contract, under the scoring scheme.

Okay. If the offeror partners with a JV as a new business entity, can the relevant experience of the JV components be used if the unpopulated JV consists of small businesses?

Yeah, I think that I've already answered that, and I thank that the language in the RFP actually is pretty clear on that.

If we had successfully completed an ISO cert that are awaiting the certificate, can we submit the audit letter in lieu of the certificate?

You can submit it, and what the, for it to be, for us to agree that it meets the requirements, that letter would have to unequivocally say that you were awarded that certificate and it's in the mail. That you'll be getting it in two weeks, or whatever.

The letter can't say something like we finished the audit. You can expect our results. It has to unequivocally say that you actually got the certification.

Page 170

Since contractors have no control of the timing of CPARs to be available on PPIRs, can a J.P-5 be submitted to qualify a PSC and/or LET project for a period of performance of less than one year?

2.2

Page: 43 (169 - 172)

Well, the first thing, the RFP is clear that if a period of performance is less thank one year, there's three exceptions if a CPARS or PPIRS exit (inaudible). An award fee letter exists, or if a, if it's less than a year and the period of performance is totally complete.

 $\label{eq:continuous} \mbox{I'm not exactly sure what the question}$ is. $\mbox{I'm going to pass on that one for a minute.}$

Okay. Would an interim top secret facility clearance give vendor the points for top secret?

The answer to that question is that if you had been provided an interim top secret facility clearance, for our purposes, that's a subset of a top secret facility clearance. If they've awarded you an interim top secret facility clearance, and you're actually performing that

Page 171

work that provided that, that they provided that facility clearance to you for, then we would consider that a top secret facility.

 $$\operatorname{But},$$ once again, it would have to be that unequivocal evidence that I was talking about earlier.

What if the PSC and FPDS does not match the sow well, but we cannot get the CO or COTR to agree to changing the PSC for the proposal, can we still submit this for a, can we still submit this contract for a project reference using the PSC and FPDS?

Now, if you remember earlier I said we're not asking you to get the contracting officer to change anything at FPDS-NG. All we're requiring is that the PSC code, whatever the work under the PSC code, that it was integral to the project. We're not asking that the CO change anything in FPDS-NG. All that we're requiring is that the contracting officer, or the contracting officer's representative sign off on it that, yes, this PSC was a part of this project.

2.2

So, yes, you can submit it as a project. But don't try to get COs to change anything in FPDS-NG. There's other ways to verify that.

L.5.2.3, leading edge technology. Can we use individual task orders on an IDIQ for LETs experience projects?

Yes, you can. The task orders awarded under a multiple award IDIQ contract can be for all kinds of work, and those count as projects, and the solicitation in the RFP is pretty clear about that, because it goes through a whole laundry list of what we consider are relevant experience projects, and task orders are included in that, in that laundry list.

But the RFP is what rules. If you read the RFP and the sections about the definitions of what we consider what is a relevant experience project, it is pretty clear on what that is, and a task order under an IDIQ is actually one of them.

Please confirm that for an approved, I think what's trying to be said here, for approved mentor protégé 8a JV, the financial capacity and

Page 173

past performance of the mentor will be considered without exception.

What I will say is that it will be examined and considered through the evaluation rubric. This is just another question about expected number of points needed to make an award cut, and we don't have any idea what that expected number of points is, but the cut will be made at 80.

If an offeror is providing verification for PSC relevant experience projects through Option 2, the CO-COR signature, should they submit the most recent FPDS record for that project along with any additional FPDS records required to substantiate the information claimed on the relevant J.P.-2 form as required in Verification Method Number 1? The answer to that is yes. Even in Verification Method Number 2, where it's not all verified in FPDS, we still want the FPDS record, and the RFP's clear about that. It's the Statement of Work. It's the -- it's all clear in the RFP. Yes, we want the FPDS record in the

Number 1 and Number 2.

Our client is the Department of State.

We support their IT systems that are located in many foreign locations. Can we use this as a relevant experience in foreign location? The answer to that question is the work being performed in the foreign location? If it's being performed stateside for other people in a foreign location, then that wouldn't work. But if you have people working in that foreign location, then it would count.

Companies and team members must meet the size
standard at time of proposal submission
or at contract award. Well, the federal
acquisition regulations are pretty clear on that,
it's at the time that you actually say that you
are -- certifying that you are a small business,
typically at the submission of a proposal.

How much time do we have left?

What happens if a team member grows out of size standard prior to contract award? It's at the time that the proposal was submitted. They

Page 175

have to be a small business at the time that they certify that they're a small business. If we get size protests, then that'll be SBA that'll make that determination because we will just forward those size protests to SBA. And their rubric for looking at that is that what was their size when they said that they were a small business under the proposal? Not between the time the proposal was submitted and the time award is made.

You all made this up, didn't you? I think I got a fake question here. (Laughter) How do you create a sealed envelope on a CD?

(Laughter) That actually looked like your handwriting. We'll look at that ambiguity. If an amendment is needed, we will. (Laughter)

Please clarify our ability to utilize PSC code projects for LETs. Yes, you can use a PSC project in an LET relevant experience project one time. So if you have seven PSC projects, you potentially could use all seven of those one time in the LETs.

Page 176

1	Can a PSC code project be used for	1	* * * *
2	several LET references? No, it can't. It can be	2	
3	used one time.	3	
4	For additional points for MAIDIQ PSCs	4	
5	will the GSA consider multiple award contract,	5	
6	MAC, competed for state governments? No, the only	6	
7	verification for the multiple award IDIQs is the	7	
8	FPDS-NG. And the state governments would not be	8	
9	in FPDS-NG. We're looking for experience working	9	
10	under a contract, multiple award IDIQ contract,	10	
11	where you're competing for task orders under Fair	11	
12	Opportunity.	12	
13	PSC code table. Would the government be	13	
14	open to adding other PSC codes to the PSC code	14	
15	chart if the offeror can justify that the service	15	
16	under that code are IT service- related?	16	
17	MR. COLE: Greg, let's make that the	17	
18	last question.	18	
19	MR. BYRD:: : Okay. We're actually	19	
20	pretty confident on our PSC codes that we have	20	
21	chosen, especially from our technical group. And	21	
22	we believe that these are the PSC codes that are	22	
Щ	Page 177	Ш	Page 179
1	relevant to this offering, this Alliant 2 Small	1	CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC
2	Business. I don't foresee any changes to PSC	2	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
3	codes.	3	I, Carleton J. Anderson, III, notary
4	Is that the last one?	4	public in and for the District of Columbia, do
5	MR. COLE: That's it. We want to thank		hereby certify that the forgoing PROCEEDING was
6	you all very much for coming out here, again	6	duly recorded and thereafter reduced to print under
7	braving the heat, braving the Metro, braving	7	
8	security. Speaking of, we did promise them, or	8	the truth under penalty of perjury; that said
9	they actually requested that once we wrap up here	9	
10	that folks go on back out		by witnesses; that I am neither counsel for,
11	MR. BYRD:: : I'd like to make one	11	related to, nor employed by any of the parties to
12	disclaimer before I leave. If I said anything	12	the action in which this proceeding was called;
13	incorrectly up here, always remember that the RFP	13	and, furthermore, that I am not a relative or
14	rules. So it doesn't matter really what I say.	14	employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the
15	(Laughter) What matters is what	15	parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise
16	the RFP says.	16	interested in the outcome of this action.
17	MR. COLE: All right. Thank you very much. And again, please submit your questions to	17	
18	A2SB@gsa.gov and they will all be considered.	18	(Signature and Seal on File)
19 20	Thank you very much.	19 20	(Significate and Seaf On File)
21	(Whereupon, at 3:29 p.m., the	21	Notary Public, in and for the District of Columbia
22	PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.)	22	My Commission Expires: March 31, 2017
	Page 178		Page 180
ш	Anderson Court Reporting 703-519		-

Page: 45 (177 - 180)